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DoD Links to Politics

**President still gets the blame – congress perceives agencies as his responsibility**

Wallison, a codirector of AEI's program, (AEI= American Enterprise Institute )on financial policy studies Peter J. *Welcome* to AEI. Jan.1 2003. Web. 22 July 2011. <http://www.aei.org/issue/15652>.

Control over independent regulatory agencies has traditionally resided with Congress, which created all of them. The recent controversy over the Securities and Exchange Commission suggests, however, that now Congress, the White House, and the public all take for granted that the independent agencies are the president's responsibility.The political frenzy surrounding Enron's collapse and other corporate scandals may have produced--or at least exposed--a significant shift in the relationship between Congress and the White House. The efforts of congressional Democrats to pin some of the blame for the scandals on the president and the head of the Securities and Exchange Commission--and President Bush's willingness to act as though the SEC is his responsibility--may signal the end of more than a century of experimentation with independent regulatory agencies as a so-called "fourth branch" of government.

Defense spending is unpopular – Obama gets the blame

Amber Corrin Mar. "DOD, Congress at Odds over Defense Budget Cuts -- Defense Systems."  Mar 11. 2011. Web. 22 July 2011. <http://defensesystems.com/articles/2011/03/14/homepage-defense-fiscal-2012-budget-cuts.aspx>.

Recent polls have shown that the U.S. public overwhelmingly favors cutting defense spending as a means of reducing the federal budget deficit. But top defense officials warn of an impending crisis if the Defense Department's budget suffers overly drastic reductions.Now, a budgetary battle royale looms on Capitol Hill as politics, national security and a lingering financial crisis collide.High-level Pentagon officials, including Defense Secretary Robert Gates and Undersecretary of Defense and Comptroller Robert Hale, caution that national security would be jeopardized if Congress goes too far in swinging the budget ax. Recently, Gates illustrated that point with historical examples. “Retrenchment brought about by short-sighted cuts could well lead to costlier and more tragic consequences later — indeed, as they always have in the past,” Gates said Feb. 17 in testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. “Surely, we should learn from our national experience since World War I. ... Drastic reductions in the size and strength of the U.S. military make armed conflict all the more likely, with an unacceptably high cost in American blood and treasure.”Here in the present, defense experts are predicting a nasty showdown between DOD and Congress, fueled by a public tired of funding two long and costly wars.Gates has indicated that the $553 billion requested for fiscal 2012 is nearly bare-bones for the Defense Department — a sentiment shared by at least one Capitol Hill player. Rep. Buck McKeon (R-Calif.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, said he has significant concerns about that budget. He noted the $13 billion decrease from last year’s projected figure and the zero-growth rate built in for future years.However, that premise conflicts with the general mood in Washington and the rest of the country. Several recent public opinion polls clearly illustrate the public’s disillusionment with paying for war. A New York Times/CBS News poll conducted in January showed that when faced with a choice of cutting three big government programs, 55 percent of respondents chose defense spending, while 21 percent chose Medicare and 13 percent chose Social Security.Similarly, in a study by the Program for Public Consultation, people were presented with the federal budget and asked to propose changes. Those surveyed chose to reduce defense-related spending by an average of $109 billion out of about $146 billion in federal budget cuts overall.

Space Force Unpopular – Spending

Space force costs 435 billion

Leopold 2006 (George Leopold, EE Times, Pentagon urges 'relevant' R&D, 10/20/2006, <http://www.eetimes.com/electronics-news/4066300/Pentagon-urges-relevant-R-D?pageNumber=0>, accessed 7/21/11, AA)

Industry forecasters said the Pentagon will continue to spend large portions of the military budget ($435.6 billion in fiscal 2007, plus supplemental appropriations for the Iraq war totaling $130 billion this year) on developing missile defenses and an emerging U.S. "space force." But the search is also on for "transformational technologies"--many to be purchased off the shelf—that are needed to link commanders with troops on patrol in the streets of Baghdad and Kabul.

Weaponinizing space, specifically through a “space force”, its politically costly with both congress and the public.

Leopold 2006 (George Leopold, EE Times, Pentagon urges 'relevant' R&D, 10/20/2006, <http://www.eetimes.com/electronics-news/4066300/Pentagon-urges-relevant-R-D?pageNumber=0>, accessed 7/21/11, AA)

What I can also say is that even if the new presidential policy blesses the Pentagon’s space warfare strategy, it remains unclear whether Congress will be willing to fund it much beyond basic technology research. Space is an exceedingly expensive place. To fully implement the capabilities necessary to fight “in, from and through” space, hundreds of billions would have to be dedicated to developing new weapons, launching thousands of new on-orbit assts, and maintaining those systems once they are deployed. With launch costs remaining at $22,000 per kilogram, and current satellites in LEO weighing up to 4,000 kilograms, the price tag rapidly becomes exorbitant – hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars. For one thing, Congress is already expressing concerns about the costs of today’s Air Force space programs that have nothing to do with controversial ASAT or space-strike systems. Programs such as the Transformational Satellite System designed to replace current military communications satellites, and the Space Radar to replace aging U.S. early warning satellites, are years behind schedule and tens of millions of dollars over budget. Congressional reaction to Air Force budget requests for new space weapons programs based on unproven and yet undeveloped technologies may well not be all that favorable. In addition, space weapons remain controversial politically and the concept unpopular with broad U.S. public opinion – and a unilateral move by the United States to weaponize space is likely to also face harsh international political resistance and possible backlash as other nations seek to compete with their own space weapons programs. Indeed, recognizing these facts, the House Armed Services subcommittee on strategic forces, which is responsible for the military space budget, plans to hold hearings sometime in June on the question of “space control” and space weaponization.

Space Force Unpopular – Bipart Opposition

Both Democrats and Republicans agree that we shouldn’t weaponize space

WPO 08 (WorldPublicOpinion.org, a site for published studies “Large Majorities of Americans and Russians Oppose All Space Weapons” 1/23/08 <http://www.worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/international_security_bt/444.php>)

Most Americans and Russians agree that their governments should work together to prevent an arms race in space. Large majorities in both countries favor unilateral restraint and a treaty that would keep space free of weapons. Americans and Russians also support treaties that would prohibit countries from attacking or interfering with each others' satellites and from testing or deploying weapons designed to attack satellites. These are among the key findings of a WorldPublicOpinion.org poll of 1,247 Americans and 1,601 Russians developed in conjunction with the Center for International and Security Studies at the University of Maryland (CISSM). Knowledge Networks in the United States and the Levada Center in Russia conducted the interviews. Majorities in both the United States (78%) and Russia (67%) say that as long as no other country puts weapons into space, their own governments should also refrain from doing so. Most Russians (72%) and Americans (80%) also favor a new treaty banning all weapons in space. Support for such a ban was strong among Americans even when they were presented counter arguments about the potential military advantages of deploying such systems. The US poll revealed strong bipartisan consensus on the issue. Majorities in both the Republican and Democratic parties believe the US government should refrain unilaterally from deploying space weapons. There is also bipartisan backing for a treaty to ban these weapons, though support is higher among Democrats. Steven Kull, director of WorldPublicOpinion.org, noted that there was remarkable agreement within and between the two countries on the issue of space weapons. "What is striking is the robust consensus among Russians as well as Americans, and among Republicans as well as Democrats that space should not be an arena for the major powers to compete for military advantage," Kull said.

**Mars Unpopular – Generic**

**Mars mission unpopular in congress**

Jones 2009 (Naven, Freelance Journalist uncoveror.com, “Congress Bars NASA from Mars Mission” <http://www.uncoveror.com/nomars.htm>)

The US Congress does not want NASA to consider any manned mission to Mars. They are writing this ban into HR 3093, an appropriations bill that includes NASA's 2008 budget. The bill states that NASA may not pursue "development or demonstration activity related exclusively to Human Exploration of Mars." The language of the bill goes on to say why... "NASA has too much on its plate already, and the President is welcome to include adequate funding for the Human Mars Initiative in a budget amendment or subsequent year funding requests."

Mars Popular – Grassroots Lobby

**Plan popular – Grassroots lobbyists want to go to Mars**

**Keller 5/31** (Christopher Keller, May 31, 2011 Tuesday, IMHO)

Long Island has a long history with NASA and space exploration. Northrop Grumman and Sperry in Bethpage are just two of the 250 aerospace firms that have been an integral part of our space journeys and fueled the Long Island economy. **Recent economic downturns have resulted in less-than-stellar objectives for NASA.** At a time when the space program has lost its appeal and has few supporters, **NASA needs to recapture the imagination of the American people**. President Barack Obama has said we will land on an asteroid by 2025. **A manned mission to Mars should be NASA's objective, a worthy successor to the shuttle program.** President **J**ohn **F**. **K**ennedy **said,** "**We choose to go to the moon ...because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills." Kennedy would urge us to aim for Mars** without a pit stop on an asteroid along the way. War machine saps resources Mark Seratoff, East Northport: America has lost its way because Washington follows all war, all the time. This is maintained by the bottomless lobbying finances of the military-industrial complex. The masses are distracted by trivial issues. No other country in the world has military activity like ours. We have more than 700 bases around the world, maintaining readiness for a Cold War that no longer exists. We insert ourselves into other countries' affairs. How much better off would we be if the money were spent building up America? The government used to help the public more, with Public Works Administration projects, tax relief and aid to the states and local governments. Now, funds go to war expenses. A fundamental reset must take place to bring nation-building back to America.

Grassroots lobbying is extremely effective.

The National Interest 7-20-11 (7/21/11, “How to Lobby for a Foreign Government,” http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/how-lobby-foreign-government-not-get-arrested-5641)

The federal indictment that was announced Wednesday, with the arrest of a Washington-based official of the Kashmiri group, was for violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. This law, which requires those acting in a political or quasi-political capacity as agents of a foreign principal (which could be, but is not limited to, a foreign government) to put themselves on a list kept by the Department of Justice. The law has a legitimate and important purpose in facilitating transparency and making it easier to judge the motivations of those trying to influence U.S. policy. But whether or not a prosecutable case against a lobbyist can be assembled under the FARA is not the same as whether or not the lobbyist is exerting pressure on policymakers in the legislative or executive branch on behalf of a foreign government. Some of the strongest and most effective lobbying on behalf of foreign governments is done not by someone being bankrolled directly by the government in question and thus clearly an “agent,” but instead by lobbyists supported by others who strongly sympathize with the foreign government. That is true of most of what constitutes the India lobby, which thus escapes the “agent” designation. And it is true for the most part of the pro-foreign government lobby that runs circles around all of the others and that even ranks up with domestic lobbying powerhouses such as the NRA and AARP in its impact and effectiveness: the lobby that works on behalf of the Israeli government.

Mars Popular – Public

Colonizing Mars is popular.

Reske 2011 (Henry J. Reske, NewsMax, Mars Colonization Attracts Popular Support, 5/29/11, accessed 7/22/11, <http://www.newsmax.com/US/MarsColony/2011/05/29/id/398149>, AA)

A one-way ticket to Mars does not seem like something that would get many takers. However, when two scientists brought up the idea in the Journal of Cosmology, more than 1,000 people said they would be willing to help colonize the Red Planet, The Washington Post reports. Paul Davies of Arizona State University and Dirk Schulze-Makuch of the University of Washington proposed a one-way colonizing mission to the fourth planet from the sun. Davies told the Post that “our initial goal was to find a way to develop a human mission to Mars that could actually take place, that wouldn’t cost so much that it would be impossible to pull off. And the one-way trip, as we costed it out, would be about one-quarter the price of a there-and-back mission.” The response showed that the spirit of exploration is alive and well, Davies said. “Just like with earlier explorers, they are prepared to set out knowing they won’t come back, but willing to do it because their time on Mars would be so remarkable,” he said. Schulze-Makuch, who said the goal is to start a colony on Mars, imagines the first batch of colonists living in a lava tube or some in a shelter they haul along with them.

People want to colonize Mars.

Schulze-Makuch and Davies 2010 (Dirk Schulze-Makuch, Ph.D. and Paul Davies, Ph.D. To Boldly Go: A One-Way Human Mission to Mars, October-November 2010, <http://journalofcosmology.com/Mars108.html>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

While the pragmatic advantages of this approach are clear, we anticipate that some ethical considerations may be raised against it. Some in the space agencies or public might feel that the astronauts are being abandoned on Mars, or sacrificed for the sake of the project. However, the situation these first Martian settlers are in, who would of course be volunteers, would really be little different from the first white settlers of the North American continent, who left Europe with little expectation of return. Explorers such as Columbus, Frobisher, Scott and Amundsen, while not embarking on their voyages with the intention of staying at their destination, nevertheless took huge personal risks to explore new lands, in the knowledge that there was a significant likelihood that they would perish in the attempt. A volunteer signing up for a one-way mission to Mars would do so in the full understanding that he or she would not return to Earth. Nevertheless, informal surveys conducted after lectures and conference presentations on our proposal, have repeatedly shown that many people are willing to volunteer for a one-way mission, both for reasons of scientific curiosity and in a spirit of adventure and human destiny. Others may raise objections based on planetary protection considerations, depending on whether indigenous life exists on Mars or not. However, any Martian biota is almost certainly restricted to microbes that would be adapted to the natural environment of that planet, and would therefore almost certainly not pose a safety concern for the colonists due to their presumably different biochemical make-up (e.g., Houtkooper and Schulze-Makuch 2007). Nevertheless, caution has to be urged since we do not know the biochemistry of the putative Martian biota at this time. Thus, it might be prudent to launch a life detection mission or even a sample return mission prior to a one-way human mission to Mars. On the other hand, if Martian organisms really do pose a hazard to human health, it may be preferable to limit the exposure to the crew of a one-way mission rather than place at risk the entire human population from a botched sample return mission (Rummel et al. 2002).

Constellation Unpopular – Public

Public see Constellation Program as an ill-conceived money –sinking black hole

CAGW, 10 (Citizens Against Government Waste is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization dedicated to eliminating waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in government. “CAGW Releases Issue Brief on NASA Constellation Program” May 26, 2010)

Today, Citizens Against Government Waste (CAGW) released an Issue Brief on the Constellation program. The brief can be accessed here on the group's web site. The Constellation is a National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) program, initiated under President George W. Bush, with the goal of putting man back on the moon by 2020. The stated goals were to gain significant experience in operating away from Earth's environment, developing new technologies required for exploring the solar system and conducting fundamental science. But the program is the latest in a series of troubled post-Apollo human spaceflight programs within the U.S. space agency, plagued by slipping deadlines and ballooning costs. "As romantic and inspirational as space flight is, the brutal reality is that the Constellation program has become a symbol of the 'old NASA,'" said CAGW President Tom Schatz. "The program is morphing into another ill-conceived government program suffering from all too familiar runaway costs. The nation cannot continue to sink unlimited dollars into this black hole." In 2006, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) estimated that the total budget required for implementing the Constellation Program (through initial lunar missions) was nearly $230 billion. In 2009, the GAO concluded that "while the agency has already obligated more than $10 billion in contracts, at this point NASA does not know how much Ares I and Orion will ultimately cost, and will not know until technical and design challenges have been addressed." Constellation's weaknesses have been extensively documented by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO), the GAO, and the Review of Human Spaceflight Plans Committee led by former aerospace executive Norm Augustine. The CBO warned in April, 2009 that "if NASA's funding was increased to about $21.1 billion annually, the agency would be able to meet its planned schedules for the Constellation program even if cost growth was consistent with the average for past programs. But that amount of funding would not permit NASA to fly the space shuttle beyond 2010 or to support the space station beyond 2015. Moreover, under this budgetary scenario, 15 of the planned science missions would be delayed past 2025." Efforts to terminate this enormously wasteful and ineffective program have encountered the usual congressional interference. Sens. Robert Bennett (R-Utah) and Richard Shelby (R-Ala.) have attached a measure protecting funding for Constellation to an emergency war funding bill. "President Obama has taken a step in the right direction by proposing to cancel the unsustainable Constellation Program in favor of looking to increased reliance on the private sector and investment in technologies that can lower the cost of human space exploration," concluded Schatz. "Congress should not interfere with this objective."

Constellation Unpopular – Spending

**Expanding Constellation is perceived as controversial new spending**  
**Handberg, 11** - Professor and Chair of the Department of Political Science at the University of Central Florida (Rodger, “Small ball or home runs: the changing ethos of US human spaceflight policy,” The Space Review, 1/17, <http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1759/1>)  
  
The US space program remained focused, not on duplicating Apollo, but on achieving another difficult goal such as going to Mars, a logical extension truly of the Apollo effort. Twice, the presidents Bush provided the presidential rationale, if not support, for achieving great things. The Space Exploration Initiative (SEI) in 1989 and the Vision for Space Exploration (VSE) in 2004 were announced with great fanfare but neither survived the realities of congressional and presidential budgeting. The VSE appeared on paper more realistic about funding, but its choices were draconian: the ISS and space shuttle were both to be sacrificed on the altar of the new program. The earlier SEI died quickly, so hard choices were not required, while the VSE in the form of the Constellation Program lingers on although its effective demise appears certain. The Obama Administration prefers another approach while the new Congress is likely more hostile to big ticket discretionary spending. If the Tea Party faction in the Republican House caucus means what it says, the future for Constellation or any other similar program is a dim one. The reality is that the Apollo program, the SEI, and the VSE are examples in space terms of the home run approach. Such efforts confront the cruel but obvious reality that the human spaceflight program is considered by the public and most of Congress to be a “nice to have,” but not a necessity when compared to other programs or national priorities. Congressional support is narrow and constituency-driven (i.e. protect local jobs), which means most in Congress only support the space program in the abstract. Big ticket items or programs are not a priority for most, given other priorities. What happens is what can be loosely termed normal politics: a situation where human spaceflight remains a low priority on the national agenda. Funding for bold new initiatives is going to be hard to come by even when the economy recovers and deficits are under control. The home run approach has run its course at least for a time; now the small ball approach becomes your mantra.

Constellation Popular – Tea Party

Tea Party Members support Constellation Program

Nelson, 6-25 (Steven, writes for The Daily Caller. “Tea Party group launches into space policy debate.” http://dailycaller.com/2011/06/24/tea-party-group-launches-into-space-policy-debate/#ixzz1SnV4dL9c<http://dailycaller.com/2011/06/24/tea-party-group-launches-into-space-policy-debate/>)

Some members of the Tea Party movement have zeroed in on a multi-billion dollar area of government spending. This time, it isn’t health care or the public debt -– but outer space. On Thursday, TEA Party in Space (TPIS) unveiled its “TEA Party Space Platform.” The group, which is affiliated with the Tea Party Patriots, hopes NASA will return “to its roots as [a research and development] agency instead of serving as a slush fund for a few influential members of Congress,” TPIS President Andrew Gasser said in a Thursday press release. Just like a political party’s platform, this agenda is made up of specific issues. Among the fourteen calls to action is for Congress to pass legislation to cap liability for commercial human spaceflight. Another of the tenets calls for a “Zero-G means Zero-Tax” arrangement, which would establish tax exemptions for business activities related to human spaceflight. Additionally, the group wants for Congress to allow NASA to cancel all existing Shuttle, Ares and Space Launch System contracts in order to force the termination of an $11 billion earmark included in the 2010 NASA Authorization Law and for NASA to “competitively bid the development of human exploration transportation capabilities.” (Did NASA scientist personally benefit from public office?) Gasser said in the Thursday press release, “Whether it’s timidity from the White House or Congress’ earmark-laden ‘compromises,’ our space dreams will be stuck on this planet unless someone articulates a vision based on economic and technical reality, so that’s what we’ve done.”

Constellation Popular – Public

Plan Popular - Americans upset about ending of Constellation Program; 52 percent supported it

Daily Press, 7-10 (Ashley Kelly, “End of space shuttle program met with mixed reviews” <http://articles.dailypress.com/2011-07-10/news/dp-nws-shuttle-folo-20110709_1_shuttle-program-space-exploration-space-station>)

As a boy, Kevin Clack was fascinated by outer space. He even went to space camp. Now that the final chapter of the space shuttle program has come, he, like others in Hampton Roads, are reflecting on the program's 30-year history. "I'm upset it's discontinuing," said Clack, of Seaford. "I feel our future is in space. … I understand budget cuts, but I feel at least some portion of our budget should go towards this type of research." The world watched Friday as the Atlantis lifted off — the launch marked the end on an era of space exploration that some viewed as magical and others as a waste of taxpayer money. The mission is expected to end July 20. "America has been in the forefront of space for a number of years," said Jack Tucker, of Virginia Beach. "It's something to be proud of."Tucker says he understands the budgetary constraints of funding the program, but thinks there is more for America to explore in space. Tucker says while he's not a fan of studies being conducted, he thinks one would be helpful in this case. "I think there should be a study done to find some part of the program that can be resurrected and continued," Tucker said. "There is lots of infrastructure in place that now is going to go idle." President Barack Obama last year canceled shuttle's successor, the Constellation program, an Apollo-like rocket system that was severely underfunded. NASA will rely on Russia to send astronauts to the space station. Private companies are competing to develop space taxis. In a statement issued Friday, Obama said the move will allow NASA to focus on deep space exploration, possibly sending astronauts to Mars by the 2030s. In a Daily Press poll, 52 percent of participants said the space program, "produced a wealth of scientific information and a range of new technologies. It's a mistake for the government to stop funding research." Seventeen percent said the program was a waste of billions of dollars. "I think space is novel, but not critical," said Dustin Stewart, of Newport News. "There's not much out there for us. … We've learned more about space from the Earth than going to space." Brooke Beard, of Newport News, agreed with Stewart. She says wants to learn more about space, but it's too expensive to fund the shuttle program. Beard says the money could be used to fund charities or to help the homeless. On the Daily Press Facebook page readers also commented on the end of the space program. One poster with the screen name Richard Clayton wrote: "Shutting down the space program will cost us money in the long-run. Without it, instead of being on the cutting edge of technology, we will be forced to buy new technologies from countries that invent them, if they decide to sell to us."

**Constellation Popular – Generic**

Congress wants to keep the constellation program.

Dinerman 10(Taylor, Consultant – Department of Defense and Reporter – Space Review, “The Collapse of NASA?”, Hudson New York, 6-9, http://www.hudson-ny.org/1366/the-collapse-of-nasa)

The attempt to kill George W. Bush's Constellation Program has thrown NASA and the US space industry into chaos. If the next human to set foot on the Moon is not a US astronaut, that change will be seen by the rest of the world as a major humiliation for this country. Those who say, "Been there, done that" will be answered with, "Can't go there, can't do that." In his testimony at the May 12th hearing, former astronaut Neil Armstrong said, "If the leadership we have acquired through our investment is allowed to simply fade away, other nations will surely step in where we have faltered. I do not believe that this would be in our best interest." Although the Constellation Program may have been modestly underfunded, it was based on technological and political reality. The new "Obama Program," however, currently proposed as a substitute for the Constellation, recommend a "flexible path" to human space exploration, yet provides no solid goals or timelines, and only a few vague promises that, with "game changing technology," NASA will someday be able to visit an asteroid or, in the very long term, send people to the moons of Mars. It is, as Apollo Astronaut Gene Cernan before a US Senate Committee on May 12th put it, "a travesty which flows against the grain of over 200 years of our history." The proposal is also based on the idea that the US cannot be the world's leader in space technology. It must now seek to subordinate its space ambitions to the international community. Even to the extent of killing off large segments of the space industry. The Constellation Program emerged in the aftermath of the Colombia disaster of February 2003; and was called the Vision for Space Exploration. It was at first hailed as the answer to NASA's prayers -- just the sort of clear direction that many of the agency's longstanding critics had demanded. Unlike George H.W. Bush's similar Space Exploration Initiative, which was eviscerated by Congress in 1991 and 1992, the Vision was carefully planned to be acceptable to a large bipartisan majority in Congress. To achieve that, this program, renamed Constellation, had to be technologically conservative; it also had to make full use of the existing workforce and infrastructure. The resistance to Obama's program on Capitol Hill and elsewhere is fierce. NASA Administrator Bolden has literally had to beg his own employees for support. Meanwhile, supporters and skeptics are at each others throats. The damage this is doing to personal and professional relationships inside the space industry is real and lasting. Ever since it was created by President Eisenhower in 1958, NASA has had a powerful grip on the American imagination. As Tom Wolfe put it: " The 'space race' became a fateful test and presage of the entire Cold War conflict between the 'superpowers' the Soviet Union and the United Startes. Surveys showed that people throughout the world looked upon the competition… as a preliminary contest proving final and irresistible power to destroy." After a rough start, the Apollo Moon landing in 1969 ended the first phase of the space race with a decisive American victory. The pictures of astronauts standing next to the flag became a permanent part of America's global image. So much so, in fact, that US enemies almost always subscribe to the belief that the Moon landings were faked. After Apollo, it became commonplace to say that NASA lost its way. On the contrary, the agency has, with remarkable tenacity, pursued an human space exploration agenda that has provided the framework for almost everything it does. First, they pursued a low-cost, safe,reliable Earth to Orbit transportation system, The Shuttle, which was supposed to provide; but due to cost-cutting by the Nixon administration and Congressional Democrats, led by Edward Kennedy and Walter Mondale in the early 1970s, it failed to live up to its potential. The agency also wanted a Space Station as a stepping stone to the Solar System. The existing International Space Station (ISS) may not be in the ideal orbit for interplanetary exploration, but it does exist and this alone is a tribute to NASA's powerful institutional will. A permanent base on the Moon, and eventually a manned landing on Mars, were the ultimate goals of the US space agency. President George W. Bush's Science Advisor, John Marbuger, explained what the end result would be during a speech in March 2006: "As I see it, questions about the the (NASA) Vision boil down to whether we want to incorporate the Solar System in our economic sphere or not." The proposal to replace the shuttle with a commercial taxi service has gotten a lot of attention. The concept is not new. During the Bush administration, NASA set up the Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) contracts, the of which were to provide cargo services to the Space Station. It was hoped that later ones would be able to carry astronauts. Sadly, the firms involved have found that they needed a lot more time and money than originally planned. Whether Bolden said it or not, there is a better than even chance that at some point they will need to be bailed out. At one time, the US-manned space program was something that the overwhelming majority of Americans could be proud of; with a few exceptions, it enjoyed strong bipartisan and popular support. It has so much visibility that many people believe it gets as much as 20 percent of the federal budget, instead of the the real number which is a little more than one-half of one percent. Now it is the object of a nasty political squabble -- mostly between the White House and Congress as a whole, rather than between Republicans and Democrats. While a few leaders in Washington are seeking a compromise, the fight over Constellation has been getting nasty. Senator Richard Shelby (R Al.), the most eager supporter of the Moon Mission, may attach an amendment forbidding NASA to cancel the Constellation to a "must pass" military appropriations bill. This would insure the programs survival at least until 2012. The turmoil inside the agency is costing time and money. Worse, it is biting into the necessary trust that is essential to all involved in the program. As long as people inside both NASA and its contractors are worried about the future of their jobs, and the possibility that they may be wasting their efforts either by working on the President's program or by working on Constellation, the situation is ripe for trouble.

**Constellation Popular – Generic**

Congress wants to keep the constellation program.

Dinerman 10(Taylor, Consultant – Department of Defense and Reporter – Space Review, “The Collapse of NASA?”, Hudson New York, 6-9, http://www.hudson-ny.org/1366/the-collapse-of-nasa)

The attempt to kill George W. Bush's Constellation Program has thrown NASA and the US space industry into chaos. If the next human to set foot on the Moon is not a US astronaut, that change will be seen by the rest of the world as a major humiliation for this country. Those who say, "Been there, done that" will be answered with, "Can't go there, can't do that." In his testimony at the May 12th hearing, former astronaut Neil Armstrong said, "If the leadership we have acquired through our investment is allowed to simply fade away, other nations will surely step in where we have faltered. I do not believe that this would be in our best interest." Although the Constellation Program may have been modestly underfunded, it was based on technological and political reality. The new "Obama Program," however, currently proposed as a substitute for the Constellation, recommend a "flexible path" to human space exploration, yet provides no solid goals or timelines, and only a few vague promises that, with "game changing technology," NASA will someday be able to visit an asteroid or, in the very long term, send people to the moons of Mars. It is, as Apollo Astronaut Gene Cernan before a US Senate Committee on May 12th put it, "a travesty which flows against the grain of over 200 years of our history." The proposal is also based on the idea that the US cannot be the world's leader in space technology. It must now seek to subordinate its space ambitions to the international community. Even to the extent of killing off large segments of the space industry. The Constellation Program emerged in the aftermath of the Colombia disaster of February 2003; and was called the Vision for Space Exploration. It was at first hailed as the answer to NASA's prayers -- just the sort of clear direction that many of the agency's longstanding critics had demanded. Unlike George H.W. Bush's similar Space Exploration Initiative, which was eviscerated by Congress in 1991 and 1992, the Vision was carefully planned to be acceptable to a large bipartisan majority in Congress. To achieve that, this program, renamed Constellation, had to be technologically conservative; it also had to make full use of the existing workforce and infrastructure. The resistance to Obama's program on Capitol Hill and elsewhere is fierce. NASA Administrator Bolden has literally had to beg his own employees for support. Meanwhile, supporters and skeptics are at each others throats. The damage this is doing to personal and professional relationships inside the space industry is real and lasting. Ever since it was created by President Eisenhower in 1958, NASA has had a powerful grip on the American imagination. As Tom Wolfe put it: " The 'space race' became a fateful test and presage of the entire Cold War conflict between the 'superpowers' the Soviet Union and the United Startes. Surveys showed that people throughout the world looked upon the competition… as a preliminary contest proving final and irresistible power to destroy." After a rough start, the Apollo Moon landing in 1969 ended the first phase of the space race with a decisive American victory. The pictures of astronauts standing next to the flag became a permanent part of America's global image. So much so, in fact, that US enemies almost always subscribe to the belief that the Moon landings were faked. After Apollo, it became commonplace to say that NASA lost its way. On the contrary, the agency has, with remarkable tenacity, pursued an human space exploration agenda that has provided the framework for almost everything it does. First, they pursued a low-cost, safe,reliable Earth to Orbit transportation system, The Shuttle, which was supposed to provide; but due to cost-cutting by the Nixon administration and Congressional Democrats, led by Edward Kennedy and Walter Mondale in the early 1970s, it failed to live up to its potential. The agency also wanted a Space Station as a stepping stone to the Solar System. The existing International Space Station (ISS) may not be in the ideal orbit for interplanetary exploration, but it does exist and this alone is a tribute to NASA's powerful institutional will. A permanent base on the Moon, and eventually a manned landing on Mars, were the ultimate goals of the US space agency. President George W. Bush's Science Advisor, John Marbuger, explained what the end result would be during a speech in March 2006: "As I see it, questions about the the (NASA) Vision boil down to whether we want to incorporate the Solar System in our economic sphere or not." The proposal to replace the shuttle with a commercial taxi service has gotten a lot of attention. The concept is not new. During the Bush administration, NASA set up the Commercial Orbital Transportation Services (COTS) contracts, the of which were to provide cargo services to the Space Station. It was hoped that later ones would be able to carry astronauts. Sadly, the firms involved have found that they needed a lot more time and money than originally planned. Whether Bolden said it or not, there is a better than even chance that at some point they will need to be bailed out. At one time, the US-manned space program was something that the overwhelming majority of Americans could be proud of; with a few exceptions, it enjoyed strong bipartisan and popular support. It has so much visibility that many people believe it gets as much as 20 percent of the federal budget, instead of the the real number which is a little more than one-half of one percent. Now it is the object of a nasty political squabble -- mostly between the White House and Congress as a whole, rather than between Republicans and Democrats. While a few leaders in Washington are seeking a compromise, the fight over Constellation has been getting nasty. Senator Richard Shelby (R Al.), the most eager supporter of the Moon Mission, may attach an amendment forbidding NASA to cancel the Constellation to a "must pass" military appropriations bill. This would insure the programs survival at least until 2012. The turmoil inside the agency is costing time and money. Worse, it is biting into the necessary trust that is essential to all involved in the program. As long as people inside both NASA and its contractors are worried about the future of their jobs, and the possibility that they may be wasting their efforts either by working on the President's program or by working on Constellation, the situation is ripe for trouble.

Constellation Popular – Bipart

The constellation program has strong bipartisan backing

Dinerman 10 (Taylor, Consultant – Department of Defense and Reporter – Space Review, “Will NASA’s Embrace Kill NewSpace?”, Space Review, 2-15, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1564/1)

Whatever her motives were, when Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) destroyed the George H.W. Bush Space Exploration Initiative in 1992, she demonstrated how a single powerful senator could wreck any president’s proposals, especially on a seemingly marginal issue like civil space policy. She went through the NASA budget and zeroed out anything that even remotely resembled funding for SEI. It took NASA many years to recover from those drastic cuts to the human space exploration technology program. If the Moon program could be described as belonging to the 20th century, the NewSpace industry is beginning to look as if they belong to the 18th century. The resentment aimed at SEI is nothing compared to what the NewSpace industry now faces on Capitol Hill. The cancellation of the Constellation program proposed in the 2011 budget is facing a bipartisan firestorm in Congress. It is doubtful that the President will want to make a special effort to support the new NASA program. His threat to veto the 2010 defense budget if it included money for the alternative F-35 engine turned out to be empty. The thousands of jobs and the irreplaceable expertise that this new plan throws away are far more important to the members of Congress, especially in the current economic climate, than are the arguments and promises from the new team at NASA. In spite of its flaws—and if anyone says there is such a thing as a flawless government program ask them what they’ve been smoking—Constellation balanced the technological, political, and legal realities of today’s government environment. The new program is the product of a philosophy that, while it may be promising in the very long term, is simply not ready for prime time. If the Moon program could be described as belonging to the 20th century, the NewSpace industry is beginning to look as if they belong to the 18th century. Like French courtiers wandering the halls of Versailles looking for a favor from the King, individuals who used to be regarded as brave entrepreneurs will now haunt the corridors of power looking for a subsidy or an earmark. They will prove their technical expertise by writing proposals that are perfectly adapted to the prevailing bureaucratic winds. It may be good business, but it does not have much to do with 21st century market capitalism. Now that the NewSpace industry is in a direct fight with the powerful members of Congress they may find that in spite of support from NASA’s leadership, they lack the political strength overcome the opposition. If the men and women who sit on the appropriations committees feel their interests and even their political survival are threatened, they will strike back, and strike back hard. Some firms that have no government contracts will be immune to this backlash, but others, particularly the small and medium-sized ones that depend on SBIRs, will be vulnerable to the appropriators’ scalpel. The poster child for NewSpace, SpaceX, which once had a number of military launch deals, may find them harder to come by at least in the near future. Since the USAF switched the TacSat missions away from the Hawthorne, California, firm, probably due to the delay’s involved with Falcon, it is hard to see them giving the company more business until it has a much better track record than it does now. It will also be fairly easy to paint NewSpace CEOs as “rent seekers”. Elon Musk’s ability at another company, Tesla, to collect government subsidies for selling very expensive luxury cars to millionaires should raise more than a few eyebrows. Spending a few billion on “technology development” programs is not going to do anything to spread human civilization into the solar system. The claim that one type of government contractor represents “free enterprise” and another group somehow represents “big government” is ludicrous. It’s all taxpayers money; the only difference is that the big aerospace firms long ago paid back (or lost) the money their founders invested in them. The Obama Administration’s attempt to buy off the opposition by spreading around $50 million in contracts under the Commercial Crew Development (CCDev) program is as transparent as their effort to defuse opposition to their health care bill by offering goodies to the insurance and pharmaceutical industries. Giving a few million to everyone from the giant ULA to the tiny Sierra Nevada may seem like a smart move, but it will do nothing to stop the broad public recognition that abandoning the Moon mission is a humiliating national defeat. The president’s political foes will not let this pass. The bitterness and anger that so many Americans feel over the end (or the proposed end) of Moon program will only grow. This fall, as the final shuttle flights take place and the mid-term elections loom, they will pull out all the stops. In some places the rhetoric will get white hot. Constellation was an all-too-rare US Government program with deep bipartisan support. Throwing it on the ash heap is a sign of just how little this administration really values the idea of working across party lines.

Constellation Popular – Bipart

The constellation program has strong bipartisan backing

Dinerman 10 (Taylor, Consultant – Department of Defense and Reporter – Space Review, “Will NASA’s Embrace Kill NewSpace?”, Space Review, 2-15, http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1564/1)

Whatever her motives were, when Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) destroyed the George H.W. Bush Space Exploration Initiative in 1992, she demonstrated how a single powerful senator could wreck any president’s proposals, especially on a seemingly marginal issue like civil space policy. She went through the NASA budget and zeroed out anything that even remotely resembled funding for SEI. It took NASA many years to recover from those drastic cuts to the human space exploration technology program. If the Moon program could be described as belonging to the 20th century, the NewSpace industry is beginning to look as if they belong to the 18th century. The resentment aimed at SEI is nothing compared to what the NewSpace industry now faces on Capitol Hill. The cancellation of the Constellation program proposed in the 2011 budget is facing a bipartisan firestorm in Congress. It is doubtful that the President will want to make a special effort to support the new NASA program. His threat to veto the 2010 defense budget if it included money for the alternative F-35 engine turned out to be empty. The thousands of jobs and the irreplaceable expertise that this new plan throws away are far more important to the members of Congress, especially in the current economic climate, than are the arguments and promises from the new team at NASA. In spite of its flaws—and if anyone says there is such a thing as a flawless government program ask them what they’ve been smoking—Constellation balanced the technological, political, and legal realities of today’s government environment. The new program is the product of a philosophy that, while it may be promising in the very long term, is simply not ready for prime time. If the Moon program could be described as belonging to the 20th century, the NewSpace industry is beginning to look as if they belong to the 18th century. Like French courtiers wandering the halls of Versailles looking for a favor from the King, individuals who used to be regarded as brave entrepreneurs will now haunt the corridors of power looking for a subsidy or an earmark. They will prove their technical expertise by writing proposals that are perfectly adapted to the prevailing bureaucratic winds. It may be good business, but it does not have much to do with 21st century market capitalism. Now that the NewSpace industry is in a direct fight with the powerful members of Congress they may find that in spite of support from NASA’s leadership, they lack the political strength overcome the opposition. If the men and women who sit on the appropriations committees feel their interests and even their political survival are threatened, they will strike back, and strike back hard. Some firms that have no government contracts will be immune to this backlash, but others, particularly the small and medium-sized ones that depend on SBIRs, will be vulnerable to the appropriators’ scalpel. The poster child for NewSpace, SpaceX, which once had a number of military launch deals, may find them harder to come by at least in the near future. Since the USAF switched the TacSat missions away from the Hawthorne, California, firm, probably due to the delay’s involved with Falcon, it is hard to see them giving the company more business until it has a much better track record than it does now. It will also be fairly easy to paint NewSpace CEOs as “rent seekers”. Elon Musk’s ability at another company, Tesla, to collect government subsidies for selling very expensive luxury cars to millionaires should raise more than a few eyebrows. Spending a few billion on “technology development” programs is not going to do anything to spread human civilization into the solar system. The claim that one type of government contractor represents “free enterprise” and another group somehow represents “big government” is ludicrous. It’s all taxpayers money; the only difference is that the big aerospace firms long ago paid back (or lost) the money their founders invested in them. The Obama Administration’s attempt to buy off the opposition by spreading around $50 million in contracts under the Commercial Crew Development (CCDev) program is as transparent as their effort to defuse opposition to their health care bill by offering goodies to the insurance and pharmaceutical industries. Giving a few million to everyone from the giant ULA to the tiny Sierra Nevada may seem like a smart move, but it will do nothing to stop the broad public recognition that abandoning the Moon mission is a humiliating national defeat. The president’s political foes will not let this pass. The bitterness and anger that so many Americans feel over the end (or the proposed end) of Moon program will only grow. This fall, as the final shuttle flights take place and the mid-term elections loom, they will pull out all the stops. In some places the rhetoric will get white hot. Constellation was an all-too-rare US Government program with deep bipartisan support. Throwing it on the ash heap is a sign of just how little this administration really values the idea of working across party lines.

Lunar Mining Unpopular – Generic

Plan Unpopular – concern over unintended consequences of lunar mining

Laskow 7-11 (Ashley, a reporter based in New York City who covers environment, energy, and sustainability issues. “Strip-mining the Moon: Bad idea, or the worst idea?” <http://www.grist.org/list/2011-07-11-strip-mining-the-moon-bad-idea-or-the-worst-idea>)

As a millennial, I don't share boomers' enthusiasm for the power of science to solve all problems. So when someone says that strip-mining the Moon for rocks rich in helium-3, heating the rocks to harvest the helium, and using that helium for nuclear fusion will solve the world's energy problems, I am inclined to say, “Ha! You power-mad old person, you are living in a science fiction story.” But that, in fact, may be the direction humanity is heading in, Moon-wise. Strip-mining the Moon won't be profitable until scientists perfect nuclear fusion. So far they've only gotten that process going for a few seconds, but real non-made-up scientists contacted for this post said that "It's totally possible. We're totally going to do it. It's going to be awesome." Helium-3 would produce a clean fusion process, leaving little of the radioactive waste that plagues nuclear fission, the process that nuclear plants use now. But Helium-3 is found rarely on Earth and is therefore worth $16 million dollars per kilo. With prices like that, resource extraction on the Moon all of a sudden becomes a fairly reasonable economic activity to pursue. EVEN THOUGH IT IS INSANE. Seriously, does this sound like a bad idea to anyone else? I, for one, am worried that pursuing the so-called "golden dream of nuclear fusion" will have some unintended consequences. But at least we’ll know what to tell the monkey when it asks why we’re blowing up the Moon.

Lunar Mining Popular – Generic

Plan Popular – support for long term economic potentials of lunar mining.

Moon Express 7-20 (a privately funded lunar transportation and data services company . “Moon Express Announces Dr. Alan Stern as Chief Scientist.” <http://www.spaceref.com/news/viewpr.html?pid=34154>)

Mountain View, CA (July 20, 2011) - Moon Express, a Google Lunar X PRIZE contender, revealed today that internationally recognized planetary scientist Dr. Alan Stern will be the Chief Scientist and Mission Architect for the company. The announcement was made as lunar scientists from around the world gather at the NASA Ames Research Park for their annual Lunar Science Forum, convened by the NASA Lunar Science Institute. Dr. Stern is the former NASA Associate Administrator for Science and is an outspoken advocate for commercial space who believes in the power of private enterprise to complement government efforts. While at NASA he presided over $4.5B of planetary science, astrophysics, heliophysics, and Earth science missions while, also serving as the Principle Investigator of the agency's New Horizon's mission to Pluto. "I am thrilled to be working with the Moon Express team as Chief Scientist," he said. "Moon Express has the business model, talent, and the resources to blaze a commercial trail to the Moon and revolutionize the way we do lunar science and exploration. The lunar future is bright." Named by Time Magazine as one of the word's most influential people, Dr. Stern has pushed many boundaries of science with innovative experiments and mission initiatives, including booking 8 suborbital spaceflights on Virgin Galactic and XCOR spaceships for space research. As Chief Scientist of Moon Express, Dr. Stern is helping the company design lunar missions that will support the company's commercial operations leading the company's research into materials on the Moon that could have scientific and economic value for Earth and space exploration. "We are honored to have a scientist of Alan Stern's caliber working with us,i said Moon Express co-founder and CEO Dr. Robert (Bob) Richards. "Alan's unique combination of optimism, deep experience, and no-nonsense style helps propel Moon Express forward while remaining focused on the achievable."About Moon Express Selected by Forbes as one of the '15 Names You Should Know', Moon Express (MoonEx) is a privately funded lunar transportation and data services company based at the NASA Ames Research Park in Silicon Valley. The company plans to send a series of robotic spacecraft to the Moon for ongoing exploration and commercial development focused on benefits to Earth and has signed a partnership agreement with NASA for development of a lunar lander system. Moon Express was founded in 2010 by Naveen Jain, a philanthropist, entrepreneur and technology pioneer who founded Intelius and InfoSpace and serves as Chairman; Dr. Robert (Bob) Richards, a founder of International Space University, who serves as CEO; and Dr. Barney Pell, Chief Architect for Bing Local Search at Microsoft and former NASA manager, who serves as Vice Chairman and Chief Technology Officer. The Moon Express co-founders also work together as Trustees of Singularity University. Moon Express has been selected by NASA for a lunar data services contract worth up to $10M. It is also one of only three U.S. companies to receive the first $500K delivery order under NASA's Innovative Lunar Demonstrations Data (ILDD) program. Moon Express is also a leading contender in the $30M Google Lunar X PRIZE (GLXP) competition, which challenges privately funded teams to place a robot on the Moon's surface that transmits high definition video, images and data back to Earth from the landing site and from 500 meters away. The GLXP is available until 2015. The Moon Express founders believe in the long-term economic potential of the Moon to produce resources essential to Earth's energy future. Moon Express has captured the interest of the mining industry and was featured in the April 2011 issue of Resource World magazine: Robot Pioneers to Mine the Moon.

Lunar Mining Popular – Cheap

**Lunar base operations can make cheaper and more efficient than Apollo.**

Jones ’95 (Eric M., editor of Appollo Lunar Space Journal. “Epilogue: When might we go back to the Moon?” <http://www.solarviews.com/eng/apoepi.htm>)

Lunar base operations will be far more complex than those that were undertaken during Apollo but, if history is any guide, by building on the Apollo experience and by taking advantage of the considerable engineering advances of the intervening years, getting ready shouldn't be as difficult or expensive as Apollo. As an example, we might note that, between 1937 and 1945, von Braun and his coworkers spent approximately 2 billion US Wartime dollars designing and testing the V-2 rocket for the German Army. Although the V-2 wasn't much more effective than the Russian-designed Scud missiles fired by Iraq during the 1991 Persian Gulf War, the cost of developing the V-2 was surprisingly close - in inflation adjusted dollars - to the cost of developing the Apollo Saturn V. In addition to the intrinsic expense of developing any new technology, one very important cause of the high cost of V-2 development was the simple fact that, at the time, there was no practical way to make more than a few basic measurements on any one test flight. When something went wrong - as it inevitably did in the years before engineers could use computers and sophisticated ground-test facilities to check out subsystems ahead of time - a series of test flights had to be conducted to pin down the source of a problem and to verify a fix. In all, the von Braun team conducted several hundred test launches, most of them spectacular failures. Twenty-five years later, when von Braun's team was designing the Saturn V, engineering design procedures and the art of telemetry had advanced to the point that only fifteen test flights (ten Saturn I's, three Saturn IB's, and only two Saturn V's) had to be conducted before the vehicle could be certified as safe enough to carry a human crew. Significantly, despite the enormous increase in complexity over the V-2, all of the test flights were successful; and, as well, the constant-dollar development cost was only about fifty percent greater than what Germany had spent on the V-2. Time brings new technologies and fresh insights and makes difficult engineering tasks far more tractable. going back to the Moon should be easier than going the first time - assuming that we haven't choked the space program in red tape before we can get started. As I said at the beginning of this epilog, for much of the 20th Century humanity has been getting used to the idea of people traveling and working and, eventually, settling in space. For fully a fifth of that century, we have been slowly sifting through the things that we learned as a results of Apollo and, in the long run, it may be that we needed time to think about it all. Because of the extraordinary circumstances of the Cold War, Apollo was undertaken on a crash schedule and, as Arthur C. Clarke noted in an essay published the week of Apollo 11, too much happened too fast for anyone to properly appreciate what had been done and where all of it might lead. Had the space program developed more along the lines that von Braun outlined in the early 50's, by the time we were ready to go to the Moon, the program might have reached a stage of relative maturity comparable to, say, the state of aviation in the post-Lindbergh/Earhart years. As with the early stages of the Air Age, the Space Age was bound to have had a period of public fascination with "firsts". But once that phase had passed and the space program had settled down to a more-or-less orderly program of development, it might have been possible, then, to think of a lunar program as a natural next step - a lunar program complete with plans for a permanent research station of the Antarctic type and, most importantly, complete with modest expectations and a commitment to the long haul. Instead, the first lunar landing came only eight years after Gagarin and, because it had all been so expensive, few saw a point in continuing. Most people were thinking in the short term - about firsts and about races and about oldest rocks - and not about the long-term value of the Moon. Lunar operations were too expensive to continue, so why think about the long term? Eventually, we will go back to the Moon to build a permanent base and to begin the crucial task of how learning how to "live off the land" and, later on, develop products and industries that will make lunar operations self-supporting. And, if Apollo was, perhaps, a step taken out of sequence, the important point is that we did have six successful landings and accumulated a wealth of samples, data, and experiences. Because of Apollo, we know what most of the Moon is made of and have developed some ideas about how lunar materials could be put to use - first as a way of making lunar base operations more efficient and less expensive and, then, as raw materials for the construction and operation of space-based industries. And we know, as well, some of the tricks and some of the pitfalls involved in getting work done on the Moon. We have a great deal to learn and great deal to do. But we have been to the Moon and can put that experience to good use as we prepare, sooner or later, to go back.

Asteroid Tracking Unpopular

Congress has already shown their intent to stop funding asteroid tracking

Johnston ’09 (Casey, August 19, Graduate of Columbia University with a B.S. in Applied Physics, Associate Writer for ARS Technica, “NASA asteroid-tracking program stalled due to lack of funds” <http://arstechnica.com/science/news/2009/08/nasa-asteroid-tracking-program-stalled-due-to-lack-of-funds.ars> DOA: 7/21/11 ARW)

The risk of an asteroid rending civilization into bits is a favorite scenario in disaster movies, but it has been none too popular with the United States government. Eleven years ago, Congress tasked NASA with detecting, tracking, and classifying large asteroids and comets that pose a threat to Earth; these are generically termed near earth objects, or NEOs. Since then, save for a small grant, NASA has funded the project on its own. Now Congress has created new goals for the program and requested that they be achieved by 2020. The National Research Committee has put out an interim report on the NEO project, and it indicates that very little progress has been made since 2005, primarily due to a lack of funding.

McCain really hates it

McCain ’00 (John, June 13, Senator of Arizona, address to the President about pork barrel cutting, Congressional Record page 10447, <http://books.google.com/books?id=cT1BOgQ2Ys8C&lpg=PA10447&ots=GM9Rkx_9Sn&dq=track%20asteroids%20congressional&pg=PA10447#v=onepage&q=track%20asteroids%20congressional&f=false> DOA: 7/21/11 ARW)

Fifteen million dollars was added for the Maui Space Surveillance System-$15 million-to improve our ability to track asteroids, I do not intend to minimize the importance of such activities but only the cast of Star Trek could conceivably have looked at a list of military funding shortfalls and concluded that a total of $19 million had to be in the fiscal year 2001 budget for this purpose. And whether $9.5 million had to be in the fiscal year 2001 should be earmarked for the West Virginia National Guard is, of course, open to question.

Debris Removal Popular – Obama

**Obama supports space debris cleanup**

**Samson ’10** (Victoria, September 29, Secure World Foundation Washington Office Director, “The 2010 Obama Space Policy:

Sustainability, International Engagement and Stability in Space”, <http://swfound.org/media/1759/obama_spacepolicy_analysis_vs.pdf> DOA: 7/21/11 ARW)

The NSP’s focus on debris monitoring and mitigation demonstrates how crucial it is that the United States and others use space in a sustainable manner. Most of these debris mitigation techniques listed in the policy document already exist as voluntary international guidelines and mandatory U.S. regulations. However, the NSP formalizes the priority and importance of limiting space debris creation and exploring debris removal technologies; as such, it opens the way for increased international cooperation on these issues. It also may give some momentum to international efforts to ensure that all space actors carry out responsible space practices in their space operations. Though the legal, policy and political aspects of debris removal are not explicitly mentioned in the policy, it lays the underpinnings for the United States to address these important matters in international fora.

NMD Unpopular – Generic

Missile Defense being cut in the Status Quo – congressional scrutiny magnifies the link

Dimascio 6/10 (Joe, reporter for politico, “Defense Bill Boosts Missile Defense Scrutiny” <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0610/38334.html>MG)

As Congress, prodded by Defense Secretary Robert Gates, casts a more watchful eye on Pentagon spending and contracting procedures, even missile defense programs may no longer get a free pass. In fact, come next year, Congress may boost scrutiny of the Pentagon’s missile defense initiatives in a way both political parties can support. In the defense authorization bill, the Senate Armed Services Committee has included two new provisions — one to increase oversight of the entire agency and another focused on a key program that Republicans want to ensure remains viable. The first requires the Missile Defense Agency to start laying down a “baseline,” or an initial figure, for how much each of its programs should cost. It’s something lawmakers and the Government Accountability Office have sought for years — and that taxpayers might be surprised doesn’t already exist. “Creating objective assessments of the costs and progress of the missile defense program brings MDA closer in line with other defense acquisition programs,” said Sen. Ben Nelson (D-Neb.), who leads the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. “It adds accountability [and] transparency and improves efficiency, which is good for the missile defense program and good for taxpayers.” The agency is no small backwater. The MDA manages the research, development and testing of all the nation’s missile defense systems, commanding an annual budget of roughly $10 billion. The agency asked for $8.4 billion next year, up several hundred million dollars over 2010, but it may have even more to spend. The Senate Armed Services Committee passed a defense authorization bill that will allow the agency to spend $10.2 billion, and the House voted for $10.3 billion. The agency oversees everything from the colossal Ground-based Midcourse Defense System — giant interceptors buried in Alaska and California designed to pick off enemy intercontinental ballistic missiles — to the administration’s new phased, adaptive approach to defending Europe, first from sea-based interceptors and later from land and high-tech projects that remain the subject of research. The agency, created by Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in 2002 as a successor to the Reagan-era Strategic Defense Initiative and the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, was initially a research and development entity, a move that shielded it from the acquisition rules that apply to most defense weapons programs. And for most of the Bush administration, the MDA enjoyed a light touch when it came to oversight. When a program’s cost grew, for example, the agency just asked for more money for the program the next year, said one congressional aide. Sen. Carl Levin (D-Mich.), chairman of the Armed Services Committee, described the problem during a 2009 speech at a missile defense conference — at a time when the administration was focused on reining in Pentagon programs in which cost growth had escalated by nearly $300 billion. “For the last eight years, MDA programs have been exempt from many of the most basic requirements of the DoD acquisition system,” Levin said. “MDA programs have suffered from extensive schedule delays and from billions of dollars of added costs. Unfortunately, we have not been in a position to say how bad these problems are because, unlike other acquisition programs, MDA programs are not required to establish firm baselines for cost and schedule, not required to measure their performance against those baselines and not subject to Nunn-McCurdy requirements to identify and address troubled programs.”

NMD Popular – Republicans

Republicans want nuclear missile defense

Shuster, Targeted news service, ‘09(Targeted News Service, “Republican Efforts to Restore Funding for Missile Defense Blocked” June 16, 2009 Tuesday 4:07 AM EST http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/?)

Republican efforts to restore funding for key components of the comprehensive missile defense system designed to protect America's homeland, forward-deployed troops, and allies were repeatedly rejected by Democrats on the House Armed Services Committee today. The Obama Administration slashed $1.2 billion from national missile defense programs in its budget submission for Fiscal Year 2010. Rep. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon (R-CA): "Considering the threat that exists, it's ludicrous to me that we would cut funding for critical national defense capabilities. Iran and North Korea both have demonstrated the capability and intent to pursue intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear weapon programs in the last year. It's critical for the United States to provide a comprehensive missile defense system that protects the U.S. homeland, as well as our forward-deployed troops and allies. Are we so confident in our diplomatic efforts with Iran and North Korea that we can afford a nearly 90 percent cut in European Missile Defense and a 35 percent cut to our homeland missile defenses in Alaska and California?" Rep. Michael Turner (R-OH), Ranking Member of the Strategic Forces Subcommittee: "With near-term and increasing threats from rogue nations such as North Korea and Iran, the need is greater than ever to strengthen America's national missile defense programs. This is essential to protect our homeland and forward-deployed troops and allies. Now is not the time to play politics with our nation's missile defense programs. I was disappointed that the majority would not even agree to my amendment to restore a modest level of funding to missile defense. Given the increasing threat and uncertainty surrounding the intent from North Korea and Iran, a policy that reduces defense of our homeland is unwise and unacceptable." Rep. Bill Shuster "North Korea has proven to the world that it is dead set at obtaining more powerful nuclear weapons and the long range missiles to carry them. Iran continues its defiance in the face of growing international pressure over its nuclear program and its election was stolen by pro-nuclear radicals who want to harm America and our allies, especially Israel. It doesn't take much to realize that the nuclear threat across the globe is growing, not shrinking. Congress must act to protect our homeland and our forward deployed troops against emerging and future threats from ballistic missiles and that means a robust missile defense program." Republican members of the House Armed Services Committee offered the following amendments during full committee consideration of the defense authorization bill with specific intent to restore funding for critical national missile defense capabilities

NMD Popular – Public

Increased comprehensive missile defense is popular with the people

Eaglen, ‘10(Mackenzie Eaglen, The Heritage Foundation Leadership for America, “Why Missile Defense” Published on August 3, 2010 http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2010/08/why-missile-defense)

A comprehensive, multi-layered missile defense should be a priority. And the vast majority of Americans support the program. A poll conducted by Opinion Research Corporation this past May reveals that 88 percent of the respondents believe that the federal government should field a system for countering ballistic missiles capable of carrying weapons of mass destruction. However, many also mistakenly believe we already have what is needed to defeat a range of threats.

SBSP Unpopular – Energy Lobby

Energy Lobbyists backlash against SBSP

**Peter Glaser 2008** (Vice President, Advanced Technology (1985-'94) Master of Science and of Doctor of Philosophy from Columbia University, 7/21/11, “An Energy Pioneer Looks Back,” <http://www.nss.org/adastra/AdAstra-SBSP-2008.pdf)EH>

Ad Astra: In light of the growing demand for dwindling hydrocarbons and the dangerous increases of greenhouse gases, do you think that the world is now primed to seriously consider space-based power systems? Glaser: No, because people can still get gas for their cars too easily. Those in the top levels of science and government know what is coming, but the average man on the street will not care unless it impacts his wallet. That is the biggest problem. The basic approach is unchanged from my initial concept. We could have built this system 30 years ago. The technology just keeps getting better. The design and implementation is a small problem compared to the much larger obstacle of getting people to understand the potential benefits. Building such a system could provide cheap and limitless power for the entire planet, yet instead of trying to find a way to make it work, most people shrug it off as being too expensive or too difficult. Of course existing energy providers will fight, too. It only makes sense that coal and oil lobbies will continue to find plenty of reasons for our representatives in Congress to reject limitless energy from the sun.

SBSP Unpopular – Energy Lobby

**Plan unpopular – Energy Lobby against alternative energy**

**The Guardian 4-20** (Fiona Harvey, environment correspondent, Wednesday 20 April 2011 <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2011/apr/20/fossil-fuel-lobbying-shale-gas>)

**Senior executives in the fossil fuel industry have launched an all-out assault on renewable** [**energy**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/energy)**, lobbying governments and business groups to reject wind and solar power in favour of** [**gas**](http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/gas), in a move that could choke the fledgling green [energy industry](http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/energy-industry). Multinational companies including Shell, GDF Suez and Statoil are promoting gas as an alternative "green" fuel. These companies are among dozens around the world investing in new technologies to exploit shale gas, a controversial form of the fuel that has rejuvenated the gas industry because it is plentiful in supply and newly accessible due to technical advances in gas extraction known as "fracking".

**Plan unpopular – Big oil wants to stay #1 in the energy industry**

**Laskow 6/17** (Sarah Laskow, Reporter, “How Big is "Big Wind"?”, June 17, 2011 Friday 5:00 PM EST)

In Washington, when some industry is called a Big Industry, the term usually refers to its political heft. But on that front, wind energy is still a lightweight. The AWEA did contribute more to political candidates than any other renewable group from 2009-2010, but the group's giving totaled just $338,348, [according](http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/indus.php?ind=E1500&goButt2.x=8&goButt2.y=11) to the Center for Responsive Politics. Compare that to the biggest player in the oil and gas industry, Koch Industries, which [gave](http://www.opensecrets.org/industries/indus.php?ind=E01) just under $1.9 million or more than five times what AWEA had to offer. **The alternative energy industry, as a whole, spent $31 million on lobbying last year; the oil and gas industry spent $145 million.**

Passing the plan is unpopular among lobbyists. Delaying current legislation will raise gas prices and imperil our future.

AIA 7/15/11 (Aerospace Industries Association-300 major companies are members. “Our Nation’s Fiscal Crisis Must Be Addressed,” 7/21/11, <http://www.aia-aerospace.org/newsroom/aia_news/our_nations_fiscal_crisis_must_be_addressed/)EH>

America’s business leaders have watched patiently as our political leaders have sought to negotiate a solution to the growing fiscal challenge facing our country. The business community understands the difficulties we are facing—from growing entitlement costs to outsized debt burdens—and we have made the hard choices within our own organizations to be fiscally responsible. Our political leaders cannot afford to delay making these tough choices any longer and as a country we cannot afford to default on our obligations, which would only lead to higher prices for all Americans for gas, mortgages and groceries and would imperil our future. The current crisis provides a great opportunity to tackle our growing fiscal challenges in a smart way that preserves our national security and economic strength. But there is no acceptable path forward that does not include action on entitlements, discretionary spending and the debt-ceiling.

SBSP Popular – Alt Energy Lobbys

**Lobbyists want alternative energy**

**Mann 6/3** (Damian Mann, Mail Tribune, Medford, Ore., June 3, 2011 Friday)

"**We need to expand**," Rudolph said, adding Amy's still plans to build a 130,000-square-foot warehouse and freezer unit at its plant in White City. Wyden and Merkley, both Democrats, denounced oil speculators, saying they are driving up the pump price by up to $1 a gallon. They visited Army’s Kitchen to highlight the damaging effect of skyrocketing fuel prices and to underscore their push to reduce America's vulnerability to foreign oil. "**Four dollars at the gas pump is absolutely unacceptable**," Merkley said. Wyden said high fuel costs are attacking the economic growth in Oregon. At a recent Senate hearing, he said, one major oil company executive said that speculation could be adding as much as $40 to the price of a barrel of oil. Wyden said it is difficult to get legislation enacted because of the power the oil companies wield in Washington, D.C. "**These are the best lobbyists in America**," he said. **Merkley, who has advocated pursuing more clean and alternative energy programs**, said, 'We have to fight our nation's addiction to imported oil."

**Plan popular – Grassroots lobby wants to explore now**

**Ali 7/13** (Ambreen Ali, reports for Congress.org, July 13, 2011 Wednesday Tax Protection Ends for Dormant Causes; IRS Hits Nonprofits Long Behind on Disclosures)

But until last month, you could still make tax-free donations to that nonprofit, People Restoring an Internationally Competitive Economy. Like tens of thousands of defunct organizations that gave up their causes years ago, DeLay's PRICE has lingered on official books because the federal government had no process to flush it out. That changed in June, when the IRS stripped tax-exemption privileges from 275,000 nonprofits that had not filed required disclosure forms. In one move, the IRS eliminated about 15 percent of the entire sector. Congress passed a law five years ago requiring the IRS to do so as a way to ensure nonprofits file information about their donors and expenses. The process has also helped shutter inactive groups to prevent misuse of the nonprofit status. "It is a game changer because nothing like this has happened before," said Lindsay Nichols, a spokeswoman for GuideStar, which collates data on nonprofits. Nichols praised the IRS move, saying it could help clarify how many tax-exempt charities and foundations are active. Despite a yearlong effort by the IRS to alert groups about the change, the sweeping revocation of tax-exempt status caught some off-guard. Groups with annual budgets of less than $25,000, which have not had to file in the past, must now do so to retain their exemption status. Scores of local American Legion groups and AARP chapters were on the list, as was the active Muslim advocacy group Council on American-Islamic Relations. IRS staff members are helping such organizations reapply for tax-exempt status. But a large chunk of the list consisted of groups that disbanded long ago. Nichols said half of the groups on the IRS list were not in the GuideStar database, indicating that they probably have not been active for years. For them, losing tax-exempt status was the final nail in the coffin of their bygone movements. PRICE, which DeLay described to Roll Call in 2003 as the only ambitious goal he set and did not meet, failed to get off the ground after it was established in 1987. Jeff Judson, a DeLay staffer who served on the PRICE board, did not respond to requests for an interview. Some of the groups, such as the Nuclear Freeze Foundation and Citizens Against Nuclear War, stopped functioning after the Cold War subsided. David Cohen, who was active in organizing grass-roots support for arms control bills, said the movement had accomplished its mission when the Berlin Wall came down. But other movements on the IRS list fizzled before they could win. Solar Action Inc. began in the 1970s to pressure the Jimmy Carter administration to adopt renewable technologies. In 1978, the group led a nationwide celebration of solar energy with millions of participants. News reports said 20,000 people gathered near the Washington Monument, which served as a giant sundial. "It created a little boom, in the aftermath of which Congress started increasing year after year the renewable energy budget," Denis Hayes, who ran the nonprofit, told Roll Call. The group splintered after the event, and its lobbying arm, Solar Lobby, failed to gain traction. "We did not have enough force at the Solar Lobby at the time when the Reagan administration was deregulating," said Hayes, who continues to promote renewable energy today as president of the Bullitt Foundation. Like Hayes, Mark Hopkins of Spacecause has remained involved with his subject. **Dennis Hayes currently serves as head of the National Space Society**, but **he launched Spacecause in the 1980s as a grass-roots lobbying arm to promote space exploration and federal investment in space programs.** **While trying to save the space station program, Spacecause members sent 40,000 letters to the White House - enough to get noticed in the pre-Internet era**. But Hopkins has since changed his mind about the effectiveness of grass-roots advocacy. "One of the things I discovered when I was doing grass-roots lobbying was that [public relations] is extremely important," he said. "We found that Congress actually pays more attention to what happens in the press than to the letters they receive." Lack of money, rather than a shift in strategy, led to the end for other groups on the list. John Cross ran the Citizens Committee on Paperwork Reduction, which successfully pressured Congress for the 1980 Paperwork Reduction Act before disbanding. He said his coalition of anti-regulation business groups could have accomplished much more. But, as it goes for many in the sector, the funds dried up. "There were a lot of things we would have liked to have done but couldn't," Cross said.

SPT Popular – Lobbyists

Lobbyist support the commercialization of space in the United States.

Spacepolitics.com 4-9-2011 (7/21/11 “New organization seeks to change the space mindset in Texas,” http://www.spacepolitics.com/category/lobbying/)EH

A big part of that effort is to convince state legislators and the state’s congressional delegation of the importance of commercial space, something he said they’re generally oblivious to despite the presence of ventures like Blue Origin in the state. “Everything is built around the NASA legacy,” Tumlinson said. “We’re going to try and change that.” One of the first efforts of the TXA, a 501(c)4 lobbying organization, is to win passage of state legislation that provides liability immunity for spaceflight operators in the state. Tumlinson said the TXA originally planned to draft its own legislation, then learned of already proposed legislation, SB 115, supported by Blue Origin, and is instead backing that. That bill passed the state Senate last month; Tumlinson said he expected the House to pass it next week and the governor to sign it “in a few weeks.” The TXA is also exploring other state legislation, such as a zero-g/zero-tax bill. The long-term goal of the TXA, though, is to get state legislators, and members of Congress, to think of space as something more than just NASA. That’s been a problem with the past with the state’s Republicans, he said, who are typically very conservative on most issues, but when it comes to space, “support a socialist space program.” That, he argues, could have benefits beyond the state’s borders. “I believe that if we can change what happens in Texas, and if I can change the behavior of the Texas delegation in Congress via-à-vis commercial space, we can hit a tipping point that begins to push the entire nation into opening the frontier.”

Space Good – Boeing Lobby

Boeing lobbying on space issues

Forbes.com associated press, 7/22/11( <http://www.forbes.com/feeds/ap/2011/06/30/business-industrials-us-boeing-lobbying_8544876.html>)

WASHINGTON -- Airplane maker and defense contractor Boeing Co. spent almost $4.1 million in the first quarter lobbying the government on space issues, pilot training, and other aerospace and defense issues. [Boeing](http://finapps.forbes.com/finapps/jsp/finance/compinfo/CIAtAGlance.jsp?tkr=BA) gets about half of its revenue from defense work and space exploration. Its lobbying included NASA funding, funding for the International Space Station, commercial spaceflight and science education. [Description: image](http://del.icio.us/post)del.icio.us[Description: image](http://digg.com/submit)Digg It![Description: image](http://pa.yahoo.com/*http:/us.rd.yahoo.com/evt=39255/SIG=123j9cm40/**http:/www.forbes.com/fdc/rss.html?partner=myyahoo)yahoo[[Description: image](http://www.facebook.com/sharer.php?u=)Facebook](http://www.facebook.com/sharer.php?u=)

Lobbying Works

Grassroots lobbying is extremely effective.

The National Interest 7-20-11 (7/21/11, “How to Lobby for a Foreign Government,” http://nationalinterest.org/blog/paul-pillar/how-lobby-foreign-government-not-get-arrested-5641)

The federal indictment that was announced Wednesday, with the arrest of a Washington-based official of the Kashmiri group, was for violation of the Foreign Agents Registration Act. This law, which requires those acting in a political or quasi-political capacity as agents of a foreign principal (which could be, but is not limited to, a foreign government) to put themselves on a list kept by the Department of Justice. The law has a legitimate and important purpose in facilitating transparency and making it easier to judge the motivations of those trying to influence U.S. policy. But whether or not a prosecutable case against a lobbyist can be assembled under the FARA is not the same as whether or not the lobbyist is exerting pressure on policymakers in the legislative or executive branch on behalf of a foreign government. Some of the strongest and most effective lobbying on behalf of foreign governments is done not by someone being bankrolled directly by the government in question and thus clearly an “agent,” but instead by lobbyists supported by others who strongly sympathize with the foreign government. That is true of most of what constitutes the India lobby, which thus escapes the “agent” designation. And it is true for the most part of the pro-foreign government lobby that runs circles around all of the others and that even ranks up with domestic lobbying powerhouses such as the NRA and AARP in its impact and effectiveness: the lobby that works on behalf of the Israeli government.

**Lobbying is effective**

**Harwood 5/21** (William Harwood, Kennedy Space Centre, Endeavour Mission Accomplished, May 21 2011)

''Not a single one was broken, not a single electronic channel was malfunctioning. Right away, we began to see an enormous amount of data coming down.'' Holding up sample graphs showing the passages of an electron and a carbon nucleus, Dr Ting said, ''We're very pleased. It took us 17 years to build this thing.'' Over time, he said, the scientists on the project hope to make an important contribution to our understanding of the origin of the universe. Carried aloft in Endeavour's cargo bay, the 6.8tonne Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer was attached to the right side of the space station's solar power truss using the orbiter's robot arm and a similar crane on the lab complex. After the instrument was locked in place, an umbilical carrying power and data was attached by remote control. Within two to three hours, scientists and engineers at the Johnson Space Centre in Houston were receiving a steady stream of data. ''We have thousands and thousands of signatures already,'' Dr Ting said, referring to particle signatures. It was a welcome, long-awaited milestone for a project with a history that reads like The Perils of Pauline. After the 2003 explosion of the space shuttle Columbia, the project was bumped from NASA's manifest. **A lobbying campaign by Dr Ting and his colleagues eventually won over President Barack Obama and key lawmakers, who approved financing for an extra shuttle flight to get the particle-detecting magnet into orbit.** But a decision to extend the space station's life from 2015 to 2020 and beyond prompted Dr Ting's team to give up a more powerful but short- lived superconducting magnet in favour of a less powerful version, used in a 1998 test flight, that could last the life of the station. All told, Dr Ting and his team - more than 600 physicists from 60 institutions in 16 countries - have spent nearly two decades designing, building, testing and redesigning the Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer. The payoff is finally at hand. One of the mysteries the device was designed to explore is what happened to the antimatter that must have been created when the universe was born. ''If the universe comes from a big bang, before the big bang it is vacuum,'' Dr Ting said before Endeavour's launching. ''Nothing exists in vacuum.'' In the beginning, he said, ''You have matter, you must have antimatter; otherwise we would not have come from the vacuum. So now the universe is 14-billion-years-old, you have all of us, made out of matter. The question is, where is the universe made out of antimatter?'' Another subject of study for the spectrometer is dark matter, the mysterious material believed to provide the gravitational glue that holds galaxies and clusters of galaxies together. While Dr Ting's creation cannot directly detect dark matter, it possibly can detect the particles that would be produced in dark matter collisions. ''To my collaborators and I, the most exciting objective of AMS [Alpha Magnetic Spectrometer] is to probe the unknown,'' Dr Ting said, ''to search for phenomena which exist in nature, but yet we have not the tools or the imagination to find.'' Meanwhile, as NASA continued its advances in space, on Earth in Washington it was scolded for tardiness in deciding what it will do after the shuttles are retired in July. Leaders of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation sent a letter to Major- General Charles F.Bolden Jr, the NASA administrator, demanding documents detailing how the agency was carrying out the blueprint Congress passed last year for future space exploration. The plans called for development of a new heavy-lift rocket and spacecraft for missions beyond low-Earth orbit. The senators said NASA had failed to provide required reports to Congress and requested that a NASA official begin briefing them every other week about the agency's efforts.

Lobbying Fails

**Lobbying isn’t effective**

**Troxler 5/5** (Howard Troxler, St. Petersburg Times, May 5, 2011 Thursday)

The House voted to cut the length of unemployment benefits in Florida. At the Senate's insistence, that length will stay the same, as long as unemployment is above a certain level. **The Senate killed one of the most heavily lobbied bills of the session**, the push for electric companies to be able to raise rates to pay for renewable and alternative energy. ("Renewable energy" might sound like good-guy stuff, but it was really of a big cash grab by Florida Power & Light.) The Senate killed a 25 percent increase in the premiums of Citizens Property Insurance Co. - a popular idea in the short run, although it only puts off some hard decisions.

\*\*\*Debt Ceiling\*\*\*

\*\*Uniqueness\*\*

Will Pass – Generic

Obama and Boehner both want to raise the debt ceiling.

Favole and Boles 7/22 (Jared A. Favole and Corey Boles, Washington Wire, Obama, Boehner Agree: Debt Ceiling Will Be Raised, <http://blogs.wsj.com/washwire/2011/07/22/obama-boehner-agree-debt-ceiling-will-be-raised/>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

President Barack Obama and House Speaker John Boehner might not agree on how to slash the country’s deficit, but they agree on one thing: Both say the nation’s $14.29 trillion debt ceiling will be raised. President Barack Obama and House Speaker John Boehner of Ohio meet on July 7 with congressional leaders at the White House to discuss the debt ceiling and deficit reduction. (AP Photo/Pablo Martinez Monsivais) President Obama, sounding at times exasperated that talks broke down with Mr. Boehner (R., Ohio), said at a White House news conference that no matter what happens, the debt ceiling must be raised. He said he’ll tell that to congressional leaders Saturday morning when they meet at the White House. Mr. Boehner, who sent a letter to congressional colleagues Friday explaining that the talks had broken down, also said he’s “convinced” the debt ceiling will be raised.

Debt ceiling will pass now

Goetti 7/22 (Hans Goetti, CIO (Asia) Finaport, Interview on CNBC-TV18, US debt ceiling will be raised; QE3 possible: Finaport, <http://www.moneycontrol.com/news/fii-view/us-debt-ceiling-will-be-raised-qe3-possible-finaport_567974.html>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

Well I have absolutely no doubt that the debt ceiling will be raised, it could be some politicking back and forth, most likely actually. It will probably involve a solution where the democrats and the republicans both can claim victory, both have save face. But the real issue, namely the long-term deficit problem, is probably not going to be addressed. There is going to be some debt or some deficit cuts over the next 10 years heavily back loaded. It will be business as usual after that. I think in the long run, if United States wants to get their houses in order, there is absolutely no way around having a view at the whole tax regime, having a look at social security medicate and so on.

Obama could raise the debt ceiling on his own

Favole and Boles 7/22 (Jared A. Favole and Corey Boles, of DOW JONES NEWSWIRES, Nasdaq, President Obama Willing To Raise Debt Ceiling On His Own, <http://www.nasdaq.com/aspx/stock-market-news-story.aspx?storyid=201107222008dowjonesdjonline000514&title=president-obama-willing-to-raise-debt-ceiling-on-his-own>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

Obama currently doesn't have the power to raise the debt ceiling without Congress. But a last-ditch option that is being discussed by Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid (D., Nev.) and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.) would give him power to request a boost in the debt ceiling. Then, though a series of complicated votes, only a minority of lawmakers would be required to raise it.

Both parties agree that debt ceiling will be passed

Carpenter 7/22 (Bob Carpenter, The Ripley Bee, The drama continues in Washington DC, <http://www.ripleybee.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=1578&Itemid=42>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

The debt ceiling drama continues in Washington as the country faces a default date of Aug. 2. After a week of nonproductive negotiations between both parties, nothing was accomplished toward agreeing on whether to raise the countries debt ceiling another $2.5 trillion. Both parties agree that the debt ceiling will be raised, but neither party can agree on how to do it. This is a difficult issue to deal with. The country must borrow money in order to pay its debt obligations and to keep its domestic obligations intact. Granted we should not be $14.5 trillion in debt period; however, due to the past 20 years of over-spending we are, and now we find ourselves between a rock and a hard place!

Will Pass – Generic

Will pass- Congress will agree

NBC 7/18 (Kristen Welker, NBC, Buffett predicts debt ceiling will be raised, 7/18/11, <http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2011/07/18/7106020-buffett-predicts-debt-ceiling-will-be-raised>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

In an interview with NBC this afternoon in the White house briefing room, famed investor Warren Buffett said he believes a debt-ceiling deal will be passed by the Aug. 2 deadline. He said Congress needs to work past partisan boundaries, and that a failure to pass the deal would mean a global perception of America as a nation that can't think ahead. Said Buffett: We cannot go to Aug. 2 and tell the rest of the world, "Look because we're having this little fight in our sandbox back here, that we're going to essentially default on obligations of the United States for the first time in our history." That's a level of immaturity that I don't believe even this Congress is up to. So it'll happen, we'll get something, and in the end we have to get something. But why not aim high rather than aim low? Buffett also compared the gamesmanship of pushing the deal to the brink to Russian roulette. But you're running a risk that's abolsutely silly to run. I mean, why stick a gun to your head and say well there's only a bullet in one of the six chambers. So I'll spin it and pull it and it probably won't happen -- you're running a totally unnecessary risk and you're sending a signal to the rest of the world that we really can't think ahead in this country.

Will pass- Obama confident

Voice of America 7/18 (Dan Robinson, White House correspondent, Voice of America, White House: Obama Confident a Debt Ceiling Agreement will be Reached, 7/18/11, <http://www.voanews.com/english/news/White-House-Obama-Confident-a-Debt-Ceiling-Agreement-will-be-Reached-125783083.html>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

President Barack Obama said Monday that negotiations with Republicans and Democrats in Congress on an agreement to cut federal deficit spending and raise the government's debt ceiling by August 2 are "making progress." But, there still is no sign of an end to the political fight between the president and Republican congressional leaders.

Will pass- different plans possible to avoid default

NewsMax 7/17 (Hiram Reisner, NewsMax, Kyl: Debt Ceiling Will Be Raised, 7/17/11, <http://www.newsmax.com/InsideCover/JonKyl-DebtCeiling/2011/07/17/id/403877>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

Senate Minority Whip Jon Kyl says the Senate and the House are working on different plans to raise the debt ceiling and avoid default, according to Politico. “The country will not default. Whether or not there are savings achieved in the process remains open to question,” Kyl said on ABC’s “This Week.” Kyl said the Senate is currently working on a “McConnell-Reid” backup plan if the “Cut, Cap, and Balance” legislation, which includes a constitutional amendment to balance the budget, is passed in the House but fails in the Senate.

Will Pass – A2: CCB

Republicans are ready to compromise

Madison 7/21 (Lucy, writer for CSNBC News, “John Boehner: I've told GOP that a deal on debt will involve compromise, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20081533-503544.html> MG)

House Speaker John Boehner said Thursday he had prepared Republicans to expect that any deal on raising the debt ceiling would necessarily involve compromise, although he acknowledged that not all the lawmakers in his caucus would be willing to concede to such terms. In a press conference on Capitol Hill, Boehner reiterated his support for the GOP's "Cut, Cap and Balance" plan to reduce the debt, but also emphasized that he was ready to call on Republicans to compromise in order to avoid default. The Senate is set to vote on the House plan this Saturday. When asked, during his remarks, if he had "told [Republicans] that any deal is going to have to involve some compromise," Boehner responded, "I have." While "some members" may refuse to move away from the "Cut, Cap and Balance" bill, Boehner said most would not. "I'm sure we've got some members who believe that," Boehner said, when asked if he sensed that some House Republicans were "locked in" to the GOP plan. "But I do not believe that would be anywhere close to the majority," he added. "At the end of the day, we have a responsibility to act. And we have two problems; we have a debt ceiling that has to be raised and if we don't deal with the size of our debt, our credit rating is going to be downgraded."

Won’t Pass – Dems

Not even close to an agreement – Dem’s won’t deal

Condon 7/21 (Stephanie, writer for CSNBCnews, “White House and House Speaker shoot down report that debt deal reached”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20081497-503544.html> MG)

The Senate today took up the "cut, cap and balance" plan and is expected to vote on it Saturday, even though Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid said the plan "doesn't have one chance in a million of passing the Senate." Reid today also said he knew nothing of any potential agreement. "The president always talked about balance and there had to be some fairness in [the deal]," he said. "This can't all be cuts, there has to be some revenue, there has to be some balance. My caucus agrees with that and I hope the president sticks to that. I'm confident he will." Carney acknowledged today, "We are clearly under the gun here, the clock is ticking." Last month, and earlier this month, officials suggested the president and congressional leaders had to reach a deal by July 22 if they wanted to actually move the legislation through Congress and get it to the president's desk before August 2. In a July 5 press briefing, Mr. Obama said, "What I know is that we need to come together over the next two weeks to reach a deal." In recent days, however, the White House has played down the July 22 deadline. "There's a lot of expression of this mythical deadline," Carney said today. "There is no July 22 deadline." Carney said that a large deal that includes $4 trillion in deficit reduction is still on the table. He said the White House's terms of negotiation have not changed and that any large plan must include raising tax revenues. "It is absolutely essential that any grand bargain... be balanced, that it address all the long term drivers of our debt,"he said.

Won’t Pass – Reps

Won’t pass – Boehner can’t afford to deal

Condon 7/21 (Stephanie, writer for CSNBCnews, “White House and House Speaker shoot down report that debt deal reached”, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20081497-503544.html> MG)

Both the White House and House Speaker John Boehner shot down a report from the New York Times today that lawmakers in Washington are close to reaching a significant deal for raising the debt ceiling and reducing the deficit. "There is no deal, we are not close to a deal," White House Press Secretary Jay Carney said today. "The fact is there is no progress to report," but President Obama and congressional leaders are still working on "getting the most significant deal possible." Lawmakers have until August 2 to raise the legal limit the U.S. government is allowed to borrow -- which currently stands at $14.3 trillion -- before the U.S. risks defaulting on its loans. While he said they're not close to a deal, Carney said the White House is "absolutely confident that the debt ceiling will be raised." When asked whether the White House would even acknowledge if lawmakers were close to a deal, Carney remained silent. If leaders were close to a deal, it would put Boehner in a tough position, since the Senate is still debating the House-passed "cut, cap and balance plan" -- the GOP plan to make raising the debt ceiling contingent upon passing a balanced budget amendment. The "cut, cap and balance" plan has no chance in the Senate, but Boehner does not want to appear as if he's undercutting the House Republican caucus by already agreeing to another deal.

Won’t Pass – CCB

Republicans won’t deal unless Cut, Cap, and Balance gets passed

Madison 7/21 (Lucy, writer for CSNBC News, “John Boehner: I've told GOP that a deal on debt will involve compromise, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20081533-503544.html> MG)

Still, the Ohio Republican continued to press for the "Cut, Cap and Balance" plan, and argued that "the ball continues to be in the president's court" on making a deal happen. "The Republicans have laid out a responsible and detailed path forward and the House has passed it. The Senate should now pass Cut, Cap and Balance and -- and it's already cleared the house with bipartisan support and I'm hopeful that the Senate will do so as well," Boehner said. "Listen, the ball continues to be in the president's court and it's been there for some time," he continued. "If we're going to avoid default and prevent a downgrade of our credit rating, if we're going to create jobs and jumpstart the economy, I think he needs to step up and work with us on the spending cuts and reforms that the American people are demanding." Earlier on Thursday, Boehner shot down a report from the New York Times that lawmakers in Washington were close to reaching a significant deal for raising the debt ceiling and reducing the deficit. "While we are keeping the lines of communication open, there is no 'deal' and no progress to report," Boehner spokesman Michael Steel told CBS News Senior Political Producer Jill Jackson. "We are still focused on the 'Cut, Cap, and Balance' bill that passed the House with bipartisan support, and hope the Senate will take it up as soon as possible." House Majority Leader Eric Cantor also told Jackson that, while he was "unaware of any deal that has been struck," there were "all kinds of options on the table." When asked if he would support a deal with $3 trillion in cuts and a tax reform pledge that didn't include decoupling, the Virginia Republican reiterated his commitment to reducing debt and reforming entitlements. "I have said all along, as has the Speaker, that we want to try to do as much as we can to get towards reforming the system of entitlement in this country we want to make sure we put the country on to a path of fiscal balance," he said.

\*\*Impact Modules\*\*

New 1NC Impact (1/2)

Failure to raise the debt ceiling devastates military and dollar hegemony, emboldens rivals, and destroys soft power.

Lindsay 2011 [James M. Lindsay](http://www.cfr.org/experts/us-strategy-and-politics/james-m-lindsay/b2719), Senior Vice President, Director of Studies, and Maurice R. Greenberg Chair “Default Would Dim American Power” <http://www.cfr.org/us-strategy-and-politics/default-would-dim-american-power/p25486> MG

In the early 20th century, Venezuelan dictator Cipriano Castro liked to borrow money from foreign investors. But he didn't like paying them back. Big mistake. In December 1902, Britain, Italy and Germany demanded repayment. To make the point clear, warships from all three nations shelled several Venezuelan forts and blockaded the country's ports. Caracas paid up. Should Washington fail to raise the debt ceiling by Aug. 2 and thus risk defaulting on its financial obligations, the White House and Congress thankfully would not have to worry about gunboats from Europe — or, given who buys U.S. Treasurys these days, from China — appearing off America's shores. Defaults get more civilized treatment these days: Bond downgrades, panicked market sell-offs and emergency meetings of central bank officials have replaced naval bombardments and threats of war. Nonetheless, a default could still inflict significant — and wholly unnecessary — harm to America's ability to wield and project its power in the world. At a minimum, by driving up the government's borrowing costs, it would intensify pressure to cut defense spending at a time when the U.S. military is engaged in major operations across the planet. Meanwhile, America's adversaries would cheer Washington's unforced error as proof of their narrative that the United States is a fading power. The precise consequences of a default would depend in part on how it happened and how long it lasted. Although few remember it now, the United States had a brush with debt default in 1979. Back then, the Carter White House and Congress took so long to strike a deal on raising the debt ceiling that the government was late in paying holders of Treasury bills. The world might again shrug off a similar “technical default” in 2011, but one lasting several weeks or longer would be new territory for an advanced Western democracy. In the seven decades since World War II, no such country has defaulted on its debt. Russia defaulted on its loans in 1991 and again in 1998, but at the time, its economy was struggling to make the transition to capitalism, and its international clout had long been in decline. In short, we are in uncharted waters. No Western major power in recent memory has taken a manageable fiscal problem and turned it into a crisis. So what is likely to happen? A sustained default could undercut American power in four ways. The first and perhaps most certain would be to force cuts in defense spending. Luring lenders back to Treasury's auction window would require offering higher interest rates. It is estimated that the 1979 technical default pushed up the federal government's borrowing costs by about half a percentage point for much of the next decade. A half-point increase may sound like small change, but spread across trillions of dollars in debt, it is big money. The Congressional Budget Office reported in February that raising interest rates a third of a percentage point over its base-line estimate could add $1.1 trillion in additional interest expenses over the next decade, if the interest rate environment mimics that of the 1990s. Different assumptions would lead to a higher or lower projection, but all predict a bigger burden on the federal budget. If tax increases are a non-starter, the only option for shrinking the deficit would be cutting spending. Defense would not escape the budget ax, for the same reason Willie Sutton robbed banks — that's where the money is. Defense cuts would mean a smaller, less capable military. The armed services, already overstretched, would probably have to reduce troop levels. Navy and Air Force plans to recapitalize aging fleets of ships and planes would probably be scaled back, resulting in fewer of them at a higher individual cost. That would leave the United States less prepared to defend freedom of the seas and the air, or to meet potential threats from Iran, North Korea and elsewhere. Second, a default would make it harder for Washington to negotiate agreements or build alliances with other countries. Foreign capitals would conclude, not without reason, that bargaining with the White House would be a waste of time. A president who cannot persuade Congress to do what its leaders say needs to be done is not going to win passage of a new arms-control agreement or trade deal. And while President Obama's critics might cheer his loss of global clout, skepticism about what presidents can deliver in a poisonous domestic atmosphere would probably dog his successors as well. Third, a debt default would erode American soft power. The collapse of Lehman Brothers in 2008 raised doubts around the world about the wisdom of the U.S. economic model. A debt default would not only compound those fears, but would also raise similar doubts about the viability of the nation's political model. A country that lectures others about their problems but cannot fix its own hardly inspires emulation. China, Russia and America's other “frenemies,” not to mention its outright adversaries, would try to maximize the damage from a debt default. They would repeat the claim they have made for years — that America is in decline, and that their own political and economic models are ascendant — and now they would have a vivid example. The United States would remain the world's most powerful country for years to come, even in the event of a default, but in diplomacy, perception often is reality. Countries that now look to Washington for leadership and protection could decide that they're better served currying favor with Beijing and other capitals. Finally, a default poses one risk that could rewrite the rules of American foreign policy. More than just tarnishing the promise of “the full faith and credit” of the U.S. government, a default could help China, Russia and other major buyers of U.S. debt accomplish something they have been trying to do for years: find an alternative investment to U.S. Treasurys.

New 1NC Impact (2/2)

Loss of U.S. soft power is the biggest internal link to war – extinction

Barlow, Director of the Berglund Center for Internet Studies, holds the Matsushita Chair of Asian Studies at Pacific University, Ph.D. in history from UC Berkeley, 2K2 (Jeffrey, March, “American Power, Globalism, and the Internet: Editorial Essay”, The Journal of Education, Community and Values, <http://bcis.pacificu.edu/journal/2002/03/editorial.php#6>)

Much of Nye’s analysis is intended to make a relatively simple point: That the United States is indefinitely unchallengeable in terms of its “hard power”; but “soft power” is growing steadily more important in a networked world, and is the more frangible of American sources of power. There will be a natural process that somewhat vitiates the impact of American soft power in any event as other information economies mature. For example, by 2010, Nye argues, there will be more Chinese Internet users than American ones.8 While American sites will remain very attractive, because of the fact that English has become the world’s second language, China too sits at the center of a linguistic empire that not only embraces the worldwide Diaspora of Chinese people, but has also in the past embraced much of East Asia including Korea, Japan, Vietnam, and other nations. .05. A Dichotomy or a Transition? (Return to Index) Nye’s position intersects at several points with the analysis of Manuel Castells, sociologist and the author of the encyclopedic multi-volume work, The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture.9 Nye’s argument follows in time upon that of Castells in that Castells wrote in 1996, Nye after September 11, 2002. But Nye’s position is ultimately grounded in an earlier tradition of “realist” definitions of power: Power used to be in the hands of princes, oligarchies, and ruling elites; it was defined as the capacity to impose one’s will on others. Modifying their behavior. This image of power does not fit with our reality any longer10… Castells spends far more time than does Nye considering the “Information Age.” In doing so, he perhaps has the advantage in contextualizing American power. His argument is also far more dynamic. To Castells, the Information Age is an ongoing process, which he considers from a number of perspectives. Nye believes that there are two dichotomous kinds of power: “hard” and “soft”. For Castells, there are not two kinds of power, but a still incomplete transition from one kind of power to another. For Castells, power is being permanently transformed; Nye’s hard power is eroding: states, even the most powerful one, the United States, now live in an environment marked by a decentralized net of “local terror equilibria.” 11 In the past, during the Cold War, several major states and their allies established an equilibrium based upon mutual assured destruction; this prevented any one power from dominating the global political or economic system, but it also protected each of the major states from the others. Following the collapse of the Soviet Union the United States then enjoyed a brief period of near absolute dominance. .06. American Power Following 9-11(Return to Index) But global processes had already distributed a variety of weapons of mass destruction among major and minor powers, and more importantly, among non-state actors as well. September 11, 2002, revealed the vulnerabilities of even the greatest of powers to non-state actors. The devastating effect of the low-cost and relatively simple improvised weapons that were used then suddenly illuminated a terrible new world. The use of a bacteriological weapon, Anthrax, then followed quickly upon the trauma of 9-11---so quickly that historians may well treat the two events as one. This attack revealed an additional and, to many, even more terrifying vulnerability and again showed the new power of non-state actors. Castells refers to these sorts of weapons, including chemical and biological ones, as well as the feared low-yield “dirty” nuclear devices sometimes referred to as “suitcase bombs” as “veto technologies” and presumes that this new decentralized web of great and small states and non-state actors will require constant small interventions by many different powers to maintain a relative peace. This seems to be an apt description of events since September 11 as a variety of alliances, states, and international organizations have joined the campaign against terrorism. There are, then, many indications that Castells is, to a considerable degree at least, correct in his analysis of state power in the Information Age, and Nye wrong. State power is evolving toward a decentralized fabric, like all else in the Information Age. .07. The Limitations of the Networked International System (Return to Index) There are also many indications that some in the American policy-making institutions understand the implications of a world like that described by Castells. Recently (March, 2002), the Pentagon report “The Nuclear Posture Review” discussed conditions under which the United States might use nuclear weapons. This analysis immediately attracted a great deal of attention because it suggested the first-strike employment of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear powers. Since the end of World War II such use has been presumed to be outside the parameters of civilized warfare, and particularly outside American nuclear doctrine. But times have changed. As stated by one reporter, Michael Gordon, “Another theme in the report is the possible use of nuclear weapons to destroy enemy stocks of biological weapons, chemical arms and other arms of mass destruction.” 12 These are, of course, precisely the “veto technologies” listed by Castells.13 The limitation in the current international system is probably most critically, from an American point of view, that it tends to restrain unilateral American action. As a result, great attention necessarily must be paid to alliances and coalition building. But if anything terrifies the international community it is the specter of nuclear war, or the possibility of a return to a Cold War system with its attendant enormous expenses and the inherent threat of destruction. .08. The Nuclear Posture Review (Return to Index) The “Nuclear Posture Review” represents the Bush administration’s attempt to break the bonds that presently restrains American power: first-strike use of nuclear weapons effectively removes the need to consult allies. It amounts to an attempt to restore the brief period of absolute domination (and absolute security) enjoyed by the U.S. following the fall of the Soviet Union, before we had become aware of the terrible new forces that could be employed by “rogue states” and criminal organizations such as Al Quaeda. If the United States were to be successful in putting the terrorist genie back in the bottle by threatening nuclear strikes on states that both harbor terrorists and possess weapons of mass destruction, including most especially chemical and bacteriological ones, then Nye is, perhaps, correct: There are two sorts of power and the United States can continue to enjoy a near monopoly of classical “hard” power. But Nye, like Castells, recognizes that “under the influence of the information revolution and globalization, world politics is changing in a way that means Americans cannot achieve all of their international goals acting alone.”14 The uproar, both domestic and international over the implications of the “Nuclear Policy Review” is evidence of the essential accuracy of Castell’s analysis.15 Once again, the United States has discovered the limits of state autonomy in a networked system.

Dollar Heg Impact

And, collapse of dollar heg causes extinction

McCoy, History Prof at Wisconsin-Madison, ’10 (Alfred, December 6, “The Decline and Fall of the American Empire Four Scenarios for the End of the American Century by 2025” TomDispatch, <http://www.commondreams.org/view/2010/12/06-1>)

Today, three main threats exist to America’s dominant position in the global economy: loss of economic clout thanks to a shrinking share of world trade, the decline of American technological innovation, and the end of the dollar's privileged status as the global reserve currency. By 2008, the United States had already fallen to number three in global merchandise exports, with just 11% of them compared to 12% for China and 16% for the European Union. There is no reason to believe that this trend will reverse itself. Similarly, American leadership in technological innovation is on the wane. In 2008, the U.S. was still number two behind Japan in worldwide patent applications with 232,000, but China was closing fast at 195,000, thanks to a blistering 400% increase since 2000. A harbinger of further decline: in 2009 the U.S. hit rock bottom in ranking among the 40 nations surveyed by the Information Technology & Innovation Foundation when it came to “change” in “global innovation-based competitiveness” during the previous decade. Adding substance to these statistics, in October China's Defense Ministry unveiled the world's fastest supercomputer, the Tianhe-1A, so powerful, said one U.S. expert, that it “blows away the existing No. 1 machine” in America. Add to this clear evidence that the U.S. education system, that source of future scientists and innovators, has been falling behind its competitors. After leading the world for decades in 25- to 34-year-olds with university degrees, the country sank to 12th place in 2010. The World Economic Forum ranked the United States at a mediocre 52nd among 139 nations in the quality of its university math and science instruction in 2010. Nearly half of all graduate students in the sciences in the U.S. are now foreigners, most of whom will be heading home, not staying here as once would have happened. By 2025, in other words, the United States is likely to face a critical shortage of talented scientists. Such negative trends are encouraging increasingly sharp criticism of the dollar's role as the world’s reserve currency. “Other countries are no longer willing to buy into the idea that the U.S. knows best on economic policy,” observed Kenneth S. Rogoff, a former chief economist at the International Monetary Fund. In mid-2009, with the world's central banks holding an astronomical $4 trillion in U.S. Treasury notes, Russian president Dimitri Medvedev insisted that it was time to end “the artificially maintained unipolar system” based on “one formerly strong reserve currency.” Simultaneously, China's central bank governor suggested that the future might lie with a global reserve currency “disconnected from individual nations” (that is, the U.S. dollar). Take these as signposts of a world to come, and of a possible attempt, as economist Michael Hudson has argued, “to hasten the bankruptcy of the U.S. financial-military world order.” Economic Decline: Scenario 2020 After years of swelling deficits fed by incessant warfare in distant lands, in 2020, as long expected, the U.S. dollar finally loses its special status as the world's reserve currency. Suddenly, the cost of imports soars. Unable to pay for swelling deficits by selling now-devalued Treasury notes abroad, Washington is finally forced to slash its bloated military budget. Under pressure at home and abroad, Washington slowly pulls U.S. forces back from hundreds of overseas bases to a continental perimeter. By now, however, it is far too late. Faced with a fading superpower incapable of paying the bills, China, India, Iran, Russia, and other powers, great and regional, provocatively challenge U.S. dominion over the oceans, space, and cyberspace. Meanwhile, amid soaring prices, ever-rising unemployment, and a continuing decline in real wages, domestic divisions widen into violent clashes and divisive debates, often over remarkably irrelevant issues. Riding a political tide of disillusionment and despair, a far-right patriot captures the presidency with thundering rhetoric, demanding respect for American authority and threatening military retaliation or economic reprisal. The world pays next to no attention as the American Century ends in silence.

Disease Module

**Center for Disease control is among the first things to go if we default.**

**Klein 7/1/11** (Ezra, a columnist at the Washington Post as well as a contributor to MSNBC, “What Failure to Raise the Debt Ceiling Will look like”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ezra-klein/post/what-failure-to-raise-the-debt-ceiling-will-look-like/2011/05/19/AGK9tvtH.html?wprss=ezra-klein,7/21/11> PJ)

Ever wondered how many bills the federal government pays in a month? It’s not 100, or 1,000, or 10,000, or even 200,000. It’s 80 million. Every month. And according to a new analysis by the Bipartisan Policy Center, if the debt ceiling isn’t raised by Aug. 2, the Treasury Department is going to have to figure out which 30 million of those bills should go unpaid. The BPC’s analysis was led by Jay Powell, who served as undersecretary of the Treasury in George H.W. Bush’s administration. It’s not pretty. Powell and his team estimate that if we don’t raise the debt ceiling, Treasury will only be able to pay 55-60% of the federal government’s bills in August. The paper lays out a few scenarios for how that might go. In the “Protect Big Programs” scenario, Treasury pays bills related to interest on the debt, Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, defense suppliers and unemployment insurance. That means it stops paying military salaries, gives up on the FBI and the Centers for Disease Control, cuts all funding for food stamps and education, shuts down air control, tells NASA to head home, freezes the paycheck of every federal employee, and much more.

New pandemics will inevitably emerge – without vaccines they cause extinction

Yu 09 “Human Extinction: The Uncertainty of Our Fate,” Dartmouth Journal of Undergraduate Science, <http://dujs.dartmouth.edu/spring-2009/human-extinction-the-uncertainty-of-our-fate>

In the past, humans have indeed fallen victim to viruses. Perhaps the best-known case was the bubonic plague that killed up to one third of the European population in the mid-14th century (7). While vaccines have been developed for the plague and some other infectious diseases, new viral strains are constantly emerging — a process that maintains the possibility of a pandemic-facilitated human extinction. Some surveyed students mentioned AIDS as a potential pandemic-causing virus.  It is true that scientists have been unable thus far to find a sustainable cure for AIDS, mainly due to HIV’s rapid and constant evolution. Specifically, two factors account for the virus’s abnormally high mutation rate: 1. HIV’s use of reverse transcriptase, which does not have a proof-reading mechanism, and 2. the lack of an error-correction mechanism in HIV DNA polymerase (8). Luckily, though, there are certain characteristics of HIV that make it a poor candidate for a large-scale global infection: HIV can lie dormant in the human body for years without manifesting itself, and AIDS itself does not kill directly, but rather through the weakening of the immune system.  However, for more easily transmitted viruses such as influenza, the evolution of new strains could prove far more consequential. The simultaneous occurrence of antigenic drift (point mutations that lead to new strains) and antigenic shift (the inter-species transfer of disease) in the influenza virus could produce a new version of influenza for which scientists may not immediately find a cure. Since influenza can spread quickly, this lag time could potentially lead to a “global influenza pandemic,” according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (9). The most recent scare of this variety came in 1918 when bird flu managed to kill over 50 million people around the world in what is sometimes referred to as the Spanish flu pandemic. Perhaps even more frightening is the fact that only 25 mutations were required to convert the original viral strain — which could only infect birds — into a human-viable strain (10).

Disease Extensions

**CDC is an important part of epidemic control internationally; our example is this year’s Ebola outbreak in Uganda.**

WHO in 2011 (World Health Organization, May 18, 2011, “Ebola in Uganda”, <http://www.who.int/csr/don/2011_05_18/en/index.html>) AS

On 13 May 2011, the Ministry of Health (MoH) of Uganda notified WHO of a case of Ebola Haemorrhagic fever in a 12 year old girl from Luwero district, central Uganda. On 6 May she presented to a private clinic in Zirobwe town, Luwero district, with a 5-day history of an acute febrile illness with haemorrhagic manifestations. She was later referred to Bombo General Military Hospital where she died few hours after admission. Laboratory investigations at the Uganda Virus Research Institute (UVRI), Entebbe, Uganda confirmed Ebola virus (Sudan species). A sample is on route to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Atlanta, USA for additional analysis and sequencing. A National Task Force has been convened by the MoH Uganda, which is working with several partners including WHO, CDC, the African Field Epidemiology Network (AFENET) and USAID. A joint MoH, WHO and CDC team was deployed to the district on 13 May to carry out a detailed epidemiological investigation. WHO will be supporting the MoH in the areas of epidemiology and infection control. Control activities already in place include active case finding and contact tracing, enhanced surveillance, reinforcement of infection prevention and control, and of standard precautions in health care settings. WHO does not recommend that any travel or trade restrictions are applied to Uganda.

And, 85% of the CDC’s budget is awarded through government grants.

CDC in 2009 (Centers for Disease Control, international public health organization, July 29, 2009, <http://www.cdc.gov/about/business/funding.htm>) AS

The CDC awards nearly 85 percent of its budget through grants and contracts to help accomplish its mission to promote health and quality of life by preventing and controlling disease, injury, and disability. Contracts procure goods and services used directly by the agency, and grants assist other health-related and research organizations that contribute to CDC′s mission through health information dissemination, preparedness, prevention, research, and surveillance. Each year, the CDC awards approximately $7 billion in over 14,000 separate grant and contract actions, including simplified acquisitions. This website provides information on grants and business opportunities with the CDC.

And, CDC’s global programs prevent the spread of infectious diseases; protecting health without it is impossible.

Schantz and Tsang in 2003 (Peter and Victor of Division of Parasitic Diseases, National Center For Infectious Diseases, Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, June 2003, “The US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and research and control of cysticercosis”, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001706X03000391>) AS

CDC has long engaged in efforts to prevent and control infectious diseases outside the United States because it is understood that it is not possible to adequately protect the health of our nation without addressing infectious disease problems that occur elsewhere in the world. In Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2002), the US published a document entitled, ‘Protecting the Nation's Health in an Era of Globalization: CDC's Global Infectious Disease Strategy.’ The refocused strategy recognizes the accelerating pace of globalization, and the attendant risks of rapid and widespread disease transmission and provides a blueprint for consolidating, enhancing, and improving the effectiveness of CDC's efforts to prevent and control infectious diseases on a global scale. US investment in global public health: priorities and objectives

China Relations Module

Debt Ceiling is key to China relations

Lal 2011 , Subhodh S. Lal, Contributor of the Christian Post, June 10, 2011“U.S. Debt Ceiling Fight Worries Creditors in India, China”, http://www.christianpost.com/news/us-debt-ceiling-fight-worries-creditors-in-india-china-51044/, June 30, 2011

The possibility of a U.S. debt default is causing concerns within financial circles in Asian powers China and India and officials warn that this may erode the world’s confidence in the robustness of the U.S. economy. Indians are divided over the possibility and the implications of the likely debt default. In response to a related news item in one of India’s leading financial dailies, The Economic Times, a reader questions the approach being pondered over by U.S. congressmen saying that a technical default will lead the economy into a rut and will not cure the root cause. Where one reader believes that the U.S. will not default because it will slow down development the world over, and will pave way for China to be a superpower, another opines that the U.S., in fact, should default and “demonstrate the real situation [regarding the economy].” Yet another says, “The Fed has ruined a great nation. There is no way they can pay this debt back as their earnings are less than the accrued interest.” An official at India’s central bank, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, was quoted by Reuters as saying, “We don’t think [debt default] is a possibility because this could then create huge panic globally.” Indian officials say they have little choice but to buy U.S. Treasury debt because it is still among the world’s safest and most liquid investments. It held $39.8 billion in U.S. Treasuries as of March, U.S. data shows. In Washington, Vice President Joe Biden on Thursday held a closed-door meeting with congressional negotiators on the nation’s debt limit. Despite the vice president’s efforts, both Democrats and Republicans are “dug in over their views about the best course of action. Democrats believe cutting jobs in a weak economy may be unwise; Republicans argue spending cuts and deficit control are the key to economic growth,” according to The Los Angeles Times. The meeting comes after news broke out this week that a growing number of mainstream Republicans had agreed to a possible technical debt default, i.e., delaying of interest payments for a few days. Li Daokui, adviser to the People’s Bank of China, said a default could undermine the U.S. dollar, and Washington needs to be dissuaded from pursuing this course of action. “The result [of a possible U.S. debt default] will be very serious and I really hope that they would stop playing with fire,” Li said, according to Reuters. “I really worry about the risks of a U.S. debt default, which I think may lead to a decline in the dollar’s value,” Li was quoted as saying. China is the largest foreign creditor to the United States, holding more than $1 trillion in Treasury debt as of March, U.S. data shows, so its concerns carry considerable weight in Washington. Whether it is a lack of choice or a still-lingering trust in American economy, the world hopes that the U.S. will find a way to avoid pushing it into another huge global crisis. Marc Ostwald, a strategist with Monument Securities in London, was quoted by Reuters as saying that markets were working on the assumption that the U.S. debt story “will go away.” But nervousness would grow if a resolution was not reached in the next five to six weeks. The stalemate reported after the Thursday meeting led by the vice president will not allay the growing fears of financial markets in Asia and the rest of the world. President Barack Obama has been seeking to win congressional approval to raise the nation’s debt ceiling before an Aug. 2 deadline. Meanwhile, Republican lawmakers are pressing for major spending cuts by the government and see minor delays as a strategy to force the federal government to do exactly that.

**And, a Collapse of US-China relations leads to power wars.**

Friedberg in 2006 (Aaron, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, March 29, 2006, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?”, <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/016228805775124589>) AS

As a result of the painful experiences of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, contemporary Chinese strategists may be even more eager than they might otherwise be to establish a sphere of influence or zone of control that would prevent such threats from reemerging in the future**.** Reaching even further back into the past, other observers point to the fact that, before its decline and domination by outside powers, China was for many centuries the preponderant force in Asia and the hub of a Sinocentric Asian international system. As they adapt to the reality of their growing power and look for models to guide their behavior under increasingly favorable conditions, the leadership in Beijing could hearken back to this earlier era of glory and seek to reestablish China as East Asia’s preponderant power.39 Some U.S. government agencies have concluded that China’s current leaders aim to “maximize [China’s] influence within East Asia relative to the U.S.” or, more bluntly, to become “the preeminent power in Asia.”40 If this is true, and assuming that the United States continues to adhere to its century-old policy of opposing the dominance of either half of Eurasia by a hostile power or coalition, the stage will be set for an intense and possibly protracted strategic competition between the two Pacific giants.41 the security dilemma: intense Even if one does not accept the view that the PRC’s goal is to displace the United States as East Asia’s preponderant power, it is still possible to reach fairly pessimistic conclusions about the likely future character of the U.S.- China relationship by invoking the mechanism of the security dilemma.42 In other words, even if the larger political goals of both sides are, in some sense, purely defensive, the measures that each takes to secure its position and achieve its objectives may still arouse alarm and stimulate countermeasures on the other side. Such processes appear to be at work in several aspects of contemporary U.S.-China relations.

China Relations Ext

**Default increases tensions with China.**

IBT in 6/9 (International Business Times, no author given, June 9, 2011, Lexis) AS

The US is "playing with fire" by considering even a brief debt default as a means to force deeper government spending cuts, an adviser to China's central bank aid said. "I really worry about the risks of a US debt default, which I think may lead to a decline in the dollar's value," Li said. "I think there is a risk that the US debt default may happen," Li told reporters on the sidelines of a forum in Beijing. "The result will be very serious and I really hope that they would stop playing with fire."The idea of a technical default, essentially delaying interest payments for a few days, has gained a backing from a number of Republicans. Any form of default will not only threaten the global economy but also increase the growing tense relations with China. China is the largest foreign creditor to the US, holding more than $1 trillion in Treasury debt. Last week, the House met to vote on a debt-ceiling increase which was rejected. The US Treasury department has said it will run out of borrowing room by August 2nd.

And, US-China war goes nuclear and causes extinction.

Wall in 2005 (David, writer for the Japan Times, May 22, 2005, “Betting on World War III”, Lexis) AS

Interesting. Zoellick obviously thinks a war between the United States and China is on the cards. He was recently appointed cochairman, by President George W. Bush, of a new high-level bilateral forum intended to hold regular "talks on a range of political, security and possibly economic issues," according to senior administration officials. "Possibly" suggests that they may not have time to get around to economic issues, even though the smooth running of the U.S. economy is increasingly dependent on China. It suggests that Bush thinks that the political and security issues will take up most of the time; well, he would, wouldn't he, if he thought that war between the two countries is a real possibility. According to the leading foreign-policy guru of the "neocon" clique that dominates foreign policy debate in Washington, war between the two countries is inevitable. British Prime Minister Tony Blair's New Labour foreign policy think tank, the Foreign Policy Center, recently invited the guru, professor John J. Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago, to explain why he thought that a U.S.-China war was inevitable. He did just that convincingly, adding that the U.S. could not possibly win such a war. Mearsheimer's argument, that of an "offensive realist," is quite simple: Offensive realists believe that the absence of a world power, an enforcing agency, means that states are free to press their own interests in an anarchic international system of sovereign states. If a hegemon emerges in this system, it will seek to maintain its status by seeking to suppress the rise of new hegemons. With the regions of the world separated by water, the argument continues, there can be no global hegemon. But to ensure that its interests prevail throughout the world, an existing regional hegemon will need to prevent the development of any hegemonic power in regions outside its own - by war if need be, if other forms of containment prove ineffective. The senior U.S. administration officials who announced the formation of the new bilateral forum said it was established as part of the administration's efforts "to come to grips with (China's) rising influence in Asia." Although Premier Wen Jiabao recently said China has no aspirations of becoming a regional hegemon, he was being a little naive. China's rising influence in Asia has already given it a great power role verging on hegemony, helped by at least 350 nuclear-weapon-tipped missiles pointed at Taiwan and maybe Japan, too. China's ability to assert its move toward regional hegemonic status is currently limited by the U.S. military presence in the region: the troops and planes in South Korea, Japan and Guam and the 7th Fleet floating around in the area. They are backed up with nuclear weapons.

China Aggression Module

**Economic default leads to China Aggression**

**Khalilzad in 2011** (Zalmay, served as the Program Director for Strategy, Doctrine, and Force Structure at the RAND Corporation’s Project Air Force, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security”, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=2>) AS

As rival powers rise, Asia in particular is likely to emerge as a zone of great-power competition. Beijing’s economic rise has enabled a dramatic military buildup focused on acquisitions of naval, cruise, and ballistic missiles, long-range stealth aircraft, and anti-satellite capabilities. China’s strategic modernization is aimed, ultimately, at denying the United States access to the seas around China. Even as cooperative economic ties in the region have grown, China’s expansive territorial claims — and provocative statements and actions following crises in Korea and incidents at sea — have roiled its relations with South Korea, Japan, India, and Southeast Asian states. Still, the United States is the most significant barrier facing Chinese hegemony and aggression. Given the risks, the United States must focus on restoring its economic and fiscal condition while checking and managing the rise of potential adversarial regional powers such as China. While we face significant challenges, the U.S. economy still accounts for over 20 percent of the world’s GDP. American institutions — particularly those providing enforceable rule of law — set it apart from all the rising powers. Social cohesion underwrites political stability. U.S. demographic trends are healthier than those of any other developed country. A culture of innovation, excellent institutions of higher education, and a vital sector of small and medium-sized enterprises propel the U.S. economy in ways difficult. to quantify. Historically, Americans have responded pragmatically, and sometimes through trial and error, to work our way through the kind of crisis that we face today.

And, US-China war goes nuclear and causes extinction.

Wall in 2005 (David, writer for the Japan Times, May 22, 2005, “Betting on World War III”, Lexis) AS

Interesting. Zoellick obviously thinks a war between the United States and China is on the cards. He was recently appointed cochairman, by President George W. Bush, of a new high-level bilateral forum intended to hold regular "talks on a range of political, security and possibly economic issues," according to senior administration officials. "Possibly" suggests that they may not have time to get around to economic issues, even though the smooth running of the U.S. economy is increasingly dependent on China. It suggests that Bush thinks that the political and security issues will take up most of the time; well, he would, wouldn't he, if he thought that war between the two countries is a real possibility. According to the leading foreign-policy guru of the "neocon" clique that dominates foreign policy debate in Washington, war between the two countries is inevitable. British Prime Minister Tony Blair's New Labour foreign policy think tank, the Foreign Policy Center, recently invited the guru, professor John J. Mearsheimer of the University of Chicago, to explain why he thought that a U.S.-China war was inevitable. He did just that convincingly, adding that the U.S. could not possibly win such a war. Mearsheimer's argument, that of an "offensive realist," is quite simple: Offensive realists believe that the absence of a world power, an enforcing agency, means that states are free to press their own interests in an anarchic international system of sovereign states. If a hegemon emerges in this system, it will seek to maintain its status by seeking to suppress the rise of new hegemons. With the regions of the world separated by water, the argument continues, there can be no global hegemon. But to ensure that its interests prevail throughout the world, an existing regional hegemon will need to prevent the development of any hegemonic power in regions outside its own - by war if need be, if other forms of containment prove ineffective. The senior U.S. administration officials who announced the formation of the new bilateral forum said it was established as part of the administration's efforts "to come to grips with (China's) rising influence in Asia." Although Premier Wen Jiabao recently said China has no aspirations of becoming a regional hegemon, he was being a little naive. China's rising influence in Asia has already given it a great power role verging on hegemony, helped by at least 350 nuclear-weapon-tipped missiles pointed at Taiwan and maybe Japan, too. China's ability to assert its move toward regional hegemonic status is currently limited by the U.S. military presence in the region: the troops and planes in South Korea, Japan and Guam and the 7th Fleet floating around in the area. They are backed up with nuclear weapons.

Heg Module

**Declining economic trends pose a threat to the US’s position as a world hegemon; the impact to this is war among the super powers.**

**Khalilzad in 2011** (Zalmay, served as the Program Director for Strategy, Doctrine, and Force Structure at the RAND Corporation’s Project Air Force, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security”, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=2>) AS

Today, economic and fiscal trends pose the most severe long-term threat to the United States’ position as global leader. While the United States suffers from fiscal imbalances and low economic growth, the economies of rival powers are developing rapidly. The continuation of these two trends could lead to a shift from American primacy toward a multi-polar global system, leading in turn to increased geopolitical rivalry and even war among the great powers. The current recession is the result of a deep financial crisis, not a mere fluctuation in the business cycle. Recovery is likely to be protracted. The crisis was preceded by the buildup over two decades of enormous amounts of debt throughout the U.S. economy — ultimately totaling almost 350 percent of GDP — and the development of credit-fueled asset bubbles, particularly in the housing sector. When the bubbles burst, huge amounts of wealth were destroyed, and unemployment rose to over 10 percent. The decline of tax revenues and massive countercyclical spending put the U.S. government on an unsustainable fiscal path. Publicly held national debt rose from 38 to over 60 percent of GDP in three years.

[Insert Edelman from SBMD or Space Force 1AC Heg Impact]

Readiness Module

**Defense cuts without prior examination undermines global security, military readiness, and the safety of US soldiers.**

**Aguilera in 7/21** (Elizabeth, writer for Sign on San Diego, July 21, 2011, “San Diego's members of Congress weigh in on the debt ceiling debate”, <http://www.signonsandiego.com/news/2011/jul/21/san-diegos-congressional-reps-weigh-in-on-the-deb/>) AS

Congressional debate over raising the debt ceiling continues to rage in Washington D.C**.** Decisions have yet to be made on upping the ceiling, raising revenue and cutting the budget despite various proposals being bandied about. We checked in with San Diego congressional pack on the issue. Here is what they had to say: Rep. Brian Bilbray, R-Solana Beach, supported the Cut, Cap and Balance Act, which passed the House this week and is set for Senate vote on Saturday. So far, he has not endorsed any of the other plans currently being discussed. “The United States will make good on its debt obligations, but reaching our debt limit is only a symptom of the real problem. Forty cents out of every dollar our government spends is borrowed. We are not just borrowing from China to the tune of $1.16 trillion, we are stealing from our grandchildren. In order to restore certainty in our economy to bolster job growth and keep America competitive, we need to stop spending money we don’t have. Raising the debt limit without a credible plan to end Washington’s wasteful spending will destroy jobs and make our debt problems even worse." Rep. Susan Davis, D-San Diego, has not endorsed any of the current proposals. “We need a long-term plan that shows that we know how to solve our problems, pay our bills and invest in the future of the American people.” Rep. Duncan Hunter, R-Alpine, opposes the “Gang of Six” agreement, which includes cuts to defense spending. “It’s irresponsible to put defense cuts on the table without any reasonable examination of how these cuts would impact the existing force structure and, even more broadly, America’s national security. It’s also a fact that the military is facing enormous equipment shortfalls and reset burdens, underscoring the necessity for adequate investment where it’s needed most. Responsibly cutting defense spending is one thing, and there are certainly places in the defense budget that demand greater efficiency, but cutting defense spending without appropriate examination or insight is a reckless proposition. Doing so would directly undermine global security, military readiness and the safety of our nation’s military men and women, whom we all rely upon to keep us safe.”

Extinction

Spencer, 9/15/2000 (Jack - policy analyst for defense and national security at the Heritage Foundation, The Facts About Military Readiness, p. http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2000/09/BG1394-The-Facts-About-Military-Readiness)

U.S. military readiness cannot be gauged by comparing America's armed forces with other nations' militaries. Instead, the capability of U.S. forces to support America's national security requirements should be the measure of U.S. military readiness. Such a standard is necessary because America may confront threats from many different nations at once. America's national security requirements dictate that the armed forces must be prepared to defeat groups of adversaries in a given war. America, as the sole remaining superpower, has many enemies. Because attacking America or its interests alone would surely end in defeat for a single nation, these enemies are likely to form alliances. Therefore, basing readiness on American military superiority over any single nation has **little saliency**. The evidence indicates that the U.S. armed forces are not ready to support America's national security requirements. Moreover, regarding the broader capability to defeat groups of enemies, military readiness has been declining. The National Security Strategy, the U.S. official statement of national security objectives,3 concludes that the United States "must have the capability to deter and, if deterrence fails, defeat large-scale, cross-border aggression in two distant theaters in overlapping time frames."4 According to some of the military's highest-ranking officials, however, the United States cannot achieve this goal. Commandant of the Marine Corps General James Jones, former Chief of Naval Operations Admiral Jay Johnson, and Air Force Chief of Staff General Michael Ryan have all expressed serious concerns about their respective services' ability to carry out a two major theater war strategy.5 Recently retired Generals Anthony Zinni of the U.S. Marine Corps and George Joulwan of the U.S. Army have even questioned America's ability to conduct one major theater war the size of the 1991 Gulf War.6 Military readiness is vital because declines in America's military readiness **signal to the rest of the world** that the United States is not prepared to defend its interests. Therefore, potentially hostile nations will be more likely to lash out against American allies and interests, inevitably leading to U.S. involvement in combat. A high state of military readiness is more likely to deter potentially hostile nations from acting aggressively in regions of vital national interest, thereby preserving peace.

Readiness – Terrorism Impact

**The DoD’s purpose is to stop terrorism and deter threats; budget cuts hinder this ability.**

**Schake in 4/15** (Kori, writer for foreignpolicy.com, April 15, 2011, “Why the president’s proposed defense cuts are bad for the country”,

And recall that neither Secretary Gates nor Admiral Mullen will be at the helm of the Defense Department when this review is conducted. The administration will surely means test the candidates for both jobs: agreeing to wring an arbitrary $400 billion from Defense will be a precondition for either position. President Obama's program for producing these cuts is to "conduct a fundamental review of America's missions, capabilities, and our role in a changing world. I intend to work with Secretary Gates and the Joint Chiefs on this review, and I will make specific decisions about spending after it's complete." It's as though the Obama administration had never conducted a year-long evaluation of America's missions, capabilities, and our role in a changing world. And yet, the White House released its National Security Strategy less than a year ago, and the Department of Defense conducted just such a Quadrennial Defense Review in 2009-2010. This is Mao's permanent revolution: DOD is to be involved in a constant strategic review to justify ever-shrinking resources. The White House seems not to realize the Department of Defense does not exist to produce budget reports. It exists to protect and advance our national interests, to fight and win the nation's wars, to deter threats from potential adversaries, to train the military forces of friendly countries so they are better able to control the territory of their countries, to kill terrorists that pose a danger to America and its allies around the world. That the president doesn't seem to realize what DOD actually does really is bad for the country.

**Terrorism goes nuclear and causes extinction.**

Sid-Ahmed in 2004 (Mohamed, political writer, August 2004, “Extinction!”, <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm>) AS

These forces are waging a war on the international system unbound by any constraints. It is a war waged by "irresponsible" groups who do not expose themselves to the accountability of the world system, nor to transparency in any form. That is why terrorism is so difficult to cast light on and can represent a greater danger than wars waged by regular armies. During the Cold War, the overkill capabilities developed by the superpowers allowed them to use deterrence as a device to prevent nuclear conflagration; there was a tacit agreement between them that while they could, and did, engage in brinkmanship by threatening to use their weapons of mass destruction, they would desist from actually doing so. In the absence of any kind of parity between the protagonists in today's shadowy war on terror, mutual deterrence has been replaced by a process of pre-emption that incites the enemy to take anticipatory measures. The devastating attack of 11 September 2001, which claimed nearly 3,000 victims, is a case in point. What provoked the attack? Why that particular type of anticipatory blow? Is there an explanation for the sequence of events that began with raids against two US embassies in Africa, followed by the attack on an American destroyer close to Aden and climaxed with 9/11? It was a practice run for an even more devastating attack involving nuclear weapons. But if Osama Bin Laden was in possession of nuclear weapons at the time, why did he choose to go for an intricate plan entailing the hijacking of four passenger planes, tight synchronisation and split-second timing? Surely triggering a nuclear device would have been easier. Settling for the low-tech alternative of turning planes into missiles indicates that Al-Qaeda was not then in possession of nuclear weapons. Actually, the idea of linking terrorism to prohibited weapons of mass destruction came from Bush, not from the terrorists themselves, and was aimed at establishing some sort of link between Iraq and terrorism to legitimise his war against Saddam Hussein. We have reached a point in human history where the phenomenon of terrorism has to be completely uprooted, not through persecution and oppression, but by removing the reasons that make particular sections of the world population resort to terrorism. This means that fundamental changes must be brought to the world system itself. The phenomenon of terrorism is even more dangerous than is generally believed. We are in for surprises no less serious than 9/11 and with far more devastating consequences. ……….. What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilisations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive. But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Arms Race/Miscalc Module

**Defaulting on our debt causes arms race, miscalc, and increases the potential for escalatory conflict**

**Khalilzad in 2011** (Zalmay, served as the Program Director for Strategy, Doctrine, and Force Structure at the RAND Corporation’s Project Air Force, February 8, 2011, “The Economy and National Security”, <http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=2>) AS

Without faster economic growth and actions to reduce deficits, publicly held national debt is projected to reach dangerous proportions. If interest rates were to rise significantly, annual interest payments — which already are larger than the defense budget — would crowd out other spending or require substantial tax increases that would undercut economic growth. Even worse, if unanticipated events trigger what economists call a “sudden stop” in credit markets for U.S. debt, the United States would be unable to roll over its outstanding obligations, precipitating a sovereign-debt crisis that would almost certainly compel a radical retrenchment of the United States internationally. Such scenarios would reshape the international order. It was the economic devastation of Britain and France during World War II, as well as the rise of other powers, that led both countries to relinquish their empires. In the late 1960s, British leaders concluded that they lacked the economic capacity to maintain a presence “east of Suez.” Soviet economic weakness, which crystallized under Gorbachev, contributed to their decisions to withdraw from Afghanistan, abandon Communist regimes in Eastern Europe, and allow the Soviet Union to fragment. If the U.S. debt problem goes critical, the United States would be compelled to retrench, reducing its military spending and shedding international commitments. We face this domestic challenge while other major powers are experiencing rapid economic growth. Even though countries such as China, India, and Brazil have profound political, social, demographic, and economic problems, their economies are growing faster than ours, and this could alter the global distribution of power. These trends could in the long term produce a multi-polar world. If U.S. policymakers fail to act and other powers continue to grow, it is not a question of whether but when a new international order will emerge. The closing of the gap between the United States and its rivals could intensify geopolitical competition among major powers, increase incentives for local powers to play major powers against one another, and undercut our will to preclude or respond to international crises because of the higher risk of escalation. The stakes are high. In modern history, the longest period of peace among the great powers has been the era of U.S. leadership. By contrast, multi-polar systems have been unstable, with their competitive dynamics resulting in frequent crises and major wars among the great powers. Failures of multi-polar international systems produced both world wars. American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions.

Turns Case – Mars

**Defaulting on our debt cuts funding for education and NASA – turns both advantages**

**Klein 7/1/11** (Ezra, a columnist at the Washington Post as well as a contributor to MSNBC, “What Failure to Raise the Debt Ceiling Will look like”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ezra-klein/post/what-failure-to-raise-the-debt-ceiling-will-look-like/2011/05/19/AGK9tvtH.html?wprss=ezra-klein,7/21/11> PJ)

Ever wondered how many bills the federal government pays in a month? It’s not 100, or 1,000, or 10,000, or even 200,000. It’s 80 million. Every month. And according to a new analysis by the Bipartisan Policy Center, if the debt ceiling isn’t raised by Aug. 2, the Treasury Department is going to have to figure out which 30 million of those bills should go unpaid. The BPC’s analysis was led by Jay Powell, who served as undersecretary of the Treasury in George H.W. Bush’s administration. It’s not pretty. Powell and his team estimate that if we don’t raise the debt ceiling, Treasury will only be able to pay 55-60% of the federal government’s bills in August. The paper lays out a few scenarios for how that might go. In the “Protect Big Programs” scenario, Treasury pays bills related to interest on the debt, Medicare and Medicaid, Social Security, defense suppliers and unemployment insurance. That means it stops paying military salaries, gives up on the FBI and the Centers for Disease Control, **cuts all funding** for food stamps and **education,** shuts down air control, tells NASA to head home, freezes the paycheck of every federal employee, and much more.

\*\*Aff Answers\*\*

A2 – China

**No risk of an impact- China has no choice but to keep buying U.S. bonds.**

Barboza in 7/18 (David, writer for the New York Times, 7/18/2011, “China’s Treasury Holdings Make U.S. Woes Its Own”, <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/19/business/china-largest-holder-of-us-debt-remains-tied-to-treasuries.html>) AS

Most of those reserves are held in dollars, and recycled back to the United States through investments in Treasury bonds and other dollar-denominated securities — even stocks. And while some of China’s foreign exchange reserves are plowed into European and Japanese debt, those bond markets are not big or liquid enough to absorb the bulk of China’s ever-larger foreign holdings. Beijing has tried to diversify its foreign exchange portfolio by creating a sovereign wealth fund that can invest some of the reserves overseas. The government has also encouraged Chinese companies to expand overseas and to acquire mines and natural resources to fuel China’s hungry economy. But because China has too much foreign money for any other outlet to absorb, the vast majority of its fast-growing reserves continue to be destined for the United States bond market. “China has no choice but to keep buying,” said Zhang Ming, an expert at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, a Beijing research group. “After all, U.S. Treasury bonds are still the largest and most liquid investment product in the world.”

No Impact

Debt Ceiling are just scare tactics – we have money no matter what

Nazworth 7/23/11 (writer for the Christian post, Will the U.S. Face Crisis If Debt Ceiling Is Not Raised? http://www.christianpost.com/news/will-the-u-s-face-crisis-if-debt-ceiling-is-not-raised-52416/)

President Obama has warned that if the debt ceiling is not raised, Social Security checks may not go out in August. Obama also continues to warn that we may default on our debt if the debt ceiling is not raised. Rep. Louie Gohmert (R-Texas), a member of the House Tea Party Caucus, accused Obama of using “scare tactics,” and said that Obama is getting bad advice from people who are “lying” to him. “There is money there regardless of what we do,” said Gohmert. Others in the Tea Party Caucus also take the view that the debt ceiling does not need to be raised. Rep. Michele Bachmann, for instance, emphatically said in one of her presidential campaign ads that she will not vote for a debt ceiling increase. Who is right? Will we default on our debt on August 3? Can we maintain our current level of debt without dire consequences?

\*\*\*SKFTA\*\*\*

\*\*Uniqueness\*\*

Will Pass – Generic

The major obstacle holding up SKFTA has been removed

Abrams 7/22 (Jim Abrams, Associated Press, <http://www.google.com/hostednews/ap/article/ALeqM5hqm0HsQWu6q9HBdcsV9WqoXSyxYA?docId=b03ab142fcc64f2596e31c7a48f9e6cd>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

WASHINGTON (AP) — A dozen Senate Republicans say they have cleared the way for legislation to help workers displaced by foreign competition, possibly removing the main obstacle to approval of free trade agreements with South Korea, Panama and Colombia. The Obama administration supports the trade deals but says they must be linked to extension of expired sections of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program. The Republican senators said in a letter to President Barack Obama that they can assure passage of the worker aid bill by joining Democrats in moving it past any filibuster hurdles.

Will Pass – Bipart

SKFTA enjoys bi-partisan support

Carter 7/22 (Zach Carter, The Huffington Post, Business Roundtable Celebrates Strengthened GOP Support On Trade Deals, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/07/22/ceos-trade-deals_n_907401.html>, accessed 7/22/11, AA)

WASHINGTON -- A group of top CEOs celebrated Friday as a group of 12 Republican senators sent a letter to President Barack Obama announcing support for a key Democratic demand holding up three trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama. Although the trade deals -- which appear likely to send jobs abroad, reinforce corporate tax havens in Panama and threaten the safety of workers in Colombia -- are unpopular with the public, they enjoy far more support in Congress, where the chief obstacle to passage has not been the terms of the deals, but the treatment of American workers who would be laid off from the resulting offshoring.

Will Pass – Republicans

Republicans support SKFTA

**Watt**, Ian. "Sen Portman: Can Pass Trade Pacts, Job-Retraining Bill Separately." *NASDAQ Stock Market - Stock Quotes - Stock Exchange News - NASDAQ.com*. **July 22 2011**. Web. 23 July 2011. <http://www.nasdaq.com/aspx/stock-market-news-story.aspx?storyid=201107221112dowjonesdjonline000399>.

A dozen Republican senators said Friday they would back holding a separate vote to renew funding for trade-related job losses if President Barack Obama sends up free-trade agreements with South Korea, Colombia and Panama.The letter to Obama is the latest Republican effort to pressure the administration to submit the trade pacts, which have been help up in a dispute over the job-retraining program. While the Republican show of support for renewing at least some of the worker- benefit funding that expired earlier this year provides a potential path forward, administration officials said it still doesn't provide the necessary guarantee that the Trade-Adjustment Assistance program will be approved along with the trade agreements. "It's time for the president to submit these agreements," said Sen. Rob Portman (R., Ohio), a former U.S. Trade Representative who spearheaded the effort, in a statement accompanying the letter. "We can pass TAA and these export agreements in separate votes, and we can get them passed now."Sen. Roy Blunt (R., Mo.), who was scheduled to hold a briefing with Portman, said "today we have a path forward."The backing of 12 Republican senators should be enough to reach the 60 votes needed for cloture, which would clear the way for a vote on the job-retraining program. While all 12 senators wouldn't necessarily vote in favor of the final retraining bill, the Democratic-controlled Senate is expected to be able to round up enough votes to reach the majority needed to pass it.The administration has insisted that the retraining program be passed along with the free-trade agreements, though top Republicans in the Senate and House have indicated they won't support linking the legislation.Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R., Ky.) said Thursday it is unlikely there will be action on the trade agreements before Congress takes a scheduled month-long recess in August.

**Will pass- Republicans will no longer block**

**Paul Craig Roberts** (William E. Simon Chair in Political Economy, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Georgetown University and Senior Research Fellow, Hoover Institution, Stanford University. “Hegemony’s Cost,” **11/2/2007**, <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article18654.htm)-INTITIALS>)

Twelve Republican U.S. senators say they will not block the Trade Adjustment Assistance program (TAA), the controversial bill holding up the ratification of the free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea, various media reported Friday. The senators vowed that they will not attempt to block the final vote for the bill to reassure Obama that there will be no more delay from the Senate to pass the FTA.

**Will pass- Republicans will pass it by any means necessary**

**Ensinger 2011** (Dustin Ensinger, Economy in Crisis, The South Korean FTA - The Final Nail in Our Economy's Coffin, 3/15/2011, <http://www.economyincrisis.org/content/south-korean-fta-final-nail-economys-coffin>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

Senate Republicans are willing to pass three leftover trade agreements from the Bush era by any means necessary, even if that means figuratively holding the president’s nominee to head the U.S. Commerce Department hostage to extract what they want. With former Commerce Secretary Gary Locke headed to China to become U.S. Ambassador to the Asian powerhouse, the position is currently empty, and any replacement must be confirmed by two-thirds of the Senate. “So important are these deals to our economy and our relations with these key allies in Latin America that, until the president submits both agreements to Congress for approval and commits to signing implementing legislation into law, we will use all the tools at our disposal to force action, including withholding support for any nominee for commerce secretary and any trade-related nominees,” the letter, signed by McConnell and 43 other GOP senators, states. GOP Senators want the president to move forward with "free trade" pacts negotiated with Colombia, Panama and South Korea. Obama has signaled his willingness to move forward with the South Korean deal, but has said more work must be done to secure the passage of the two other trade deals.

Won’t Pass – Republicans

Won’t pass- Republicans will block.

WePartyPatriots 7/8 (Orrin Hatch Attaches Abortion Amendment to FTA, Farmers Voice Opposition to Deals, July 8th, 2011, AA <http://www.dailykos.com/story/2011/07/08/992198/-Orrin-Hatch-Attaches-Abortion-Amendment-to-FTA,-Farmers-Voice-Opposition-to-Deals>, accessed 7/23/11)

By Wednesday, however, cracks had started to show in the plan, with Republicans expressing concerns about adding TAA provisions to the implementing language for the U.S.-Korea agreement, as well as about the meeting's timing. By Thursday, hours before the mock mark-up was scheduled, Finance Committee Ranking Member Orrin Hatch (R-Utah) had spoken out in opposition and led a letter signed by Committee Republicans to President Barack Obama, calling for the measures and TAA to be considered separately. At 3 p.m., Baucus announced from the Committee's hearing room that the meeting would be cancelled due to lack of quorum because no Republican would be present, while Republicans held a press conference at another location.

Won’t pass- workers subsidies legislation is blocking passage

Berger 2011 (James T. Berger, Area Development, Free Trade Agreements Stymied by Political Roadblocks, July 2011, <http://www.areadevelopment.com/EconomicsGovernmentPolicy/July2011/US-free-trade-agreements-organized-labor-736537383.shtml>, accessed 7/23/11, AA

The South Korean agreement, as well as agreements with Colombia and Panama (a total package valued at $13 billion) is on the threshold of being sent to Congress for ratification — but there is a roadblock. None of these free trade agreements (FTAs) will go to Congress unless an accord with Congress is reached on expanded subsidies for jobless workers. According to White House economic aide Gene Sperling, “The administration will not submit implementing legislations on the three pending FTAs until we have an agreement with Congress on the renewal of a robust, expanded TAA (trade adjustment assistance) consistent with the objectives of the 2009 trade adjustment assistance law.”

Won’t pass- Bad relations between Republicans and Obama

The Hill 2011 (Ian Swanson, The Hill, Battle lines harden for Obama, Senate GOP as time for debt deal runs short, 6/30/11, <http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/169307-battle-lines-harden-between-obama-senate-gop-as-time-runs-short>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

Senate Republicans revolted against the White House Thursday as the fight over raising the debt ceiling turned sharply more bitter and bled into other issues. Just one week after House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) left talks led by Vice President Biden, negotiations to reduce deficits appear to be in ruins. GOP senators on Thursday sniped from the floor at President Obama’s lack of leadership and sought to stop any progress in the chamber. The Republicans were stung by Obama’s Wednesday press conference, when he unfavorably compared GOP lawmakers to his school-age daughters, who he said get their homework done on time. In response, Republicans blocked Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid’s (D-Nev.) request to bring legislation authorizing U.S. military action against Libya to the floor, and walked out of a planned markup of legislation implementing a free-trade agreement with South Korea.

Won’t Pass – TAA

Won’t pass- Republicans disagree with the inclusion of TAA

The Washington Post 2011(Felicia Sonmez, The Washington Post, Hatch: Congress may not pass trade deals, 6/30/2011, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/2chambers/post/hatch-congress-may-not-pass-trade-deals/2011/06/30/AGf0AFsH_blog.html>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

Ahead of the Senate Finance Committee’s first hearing on three pending trade deals, all 11 Republicans on the panel issued a letter to President Obama Thursday outlining their opposition to the administration’s inclusion of a program aimed at aiding workers who have lost their jobs due to outsourcing. “We are concerned about last minute attempts to include provisions expanding Trade Adjustment Assistance in the South Korea FTA implementing bill,” the 11 Republicans wrote in the letter. “We believe such actions are beyond the scope of TPA authority and unduly infringe on the rights of Members of the Senate to carefully weigh and debate the merits of TAA.” The letter follows a warning Thursday morning from the panel’s leading Republican, Sen. Orrin Hatch (R-Utah), that the inclusion of the Trade Adjustment Assistance program in the South Korea deal could imperil passage of the trade pacts. “This action abuses long-standing rules, procedures and precedents governing the delegation of trade negotiating authority from the Congress to the President and puts a successful vote on the South Korean FTA — the largest trade pact negotiated in more than a decade — at risk,” Hatch’s office said in the memo. The statements are the strongest warning to date that the deal announced Tuesday by the White House and congressional negotiators on the Colombia, Panama and South Korea trade deals may face a bumpy road to congressional approval.

Won’t pass- inclusion of TAA ticks off Republicans

The Hill 2011 (Bernie Becker, Vicki Needham, Erik Wasson and Peter Schroeder, The Hill, OVERNIGHT MONEY: Mock madness, 6/29/11, <http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/169157-overnight-money-mock-madness>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

It should be a happy day for Republicans, but Thursday’s scheduled mock Senate markup of the three pending trade pacts is not exactly being met with open arms by GOP lawmakers. Instead of celebrating a White House trade agreement with congressional negotiators, Republicans in both chambers remain irritated that renewal of a program to retrain workers who have lost their jobs because of foreign trade is being paired with the South Korea deal — a pact that had been seen as enjoying broad support. Senate Finance’s Thursday mock markup, a non-binding meeting, is expected to give lawmakers a chance to discuss the trade agreements and offer amendments, a step that, for many lawmakers, has been a long time coming. Post-markup, President Obama is free to accept or reject any amendments before sending the final agreements to Congress. Once on Capitol Hill, those deals will likely move under fast-track authority and can't be amended. As it stands, Senate Republicans are trying to find out if including Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA), the retraining program, as part of the Korean deal negates access to the fast track. For their part, the Obama administration and Democratic supporters will likely note that fast-track permits the inclusion of “necessary and appropriate” provisions. But we'll see how that flies with the GOP. As for other hurdles: House Republicans aren't thrilled either that TAA and Korea are being offered together, with Speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) saying he won’t consent unless Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) also agrees. Perhaps not surprisingly, prospects aren't so good on that front. On Tuesday, McConnell said the inclusion of TAA "risks losing Republican support for something we have long been calling for."

Won’t pass- Trade Adjustment Assistance program controversy

Lorber and Ackley 2011 (Janie Lorber and Kate Ackley, Roll Call, New Sources Pushing Trade Deals, 6/29/11, <http://www.rollcall.com/issues/56_147/new_sources_pushing_trade_deals-206874-1.html?pos=olobh>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

The lobbying effort comes at a pivotal time for the Korean pact and for similar deals with Colombia and Panama. Senate Finance Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.) and the White House announced an agreement Tuesday to add to the Korea pact an expansion of the trade adjustment assistance program, which provides benefits to workers who lose their jobs because of international trade. Adding those provisions could help clear the way for a vote on Korea and the other free-trade deals. But that fix is not without controversy. Already, crucial Republicans, such as Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (Ky.) and Finance ranking member Orrin Hatch (Utah), have said they oppose adding trade adjustment assistance to the Korea pact. No matter how fast Congress moves, getting a deal passed by July is all but impossible.

Won’t Pass – No Obama Push

Won’t pass- Obama is putting it off

Reuters 7/21 (EVAN RAMSTAD, Reuters, USTR says deal needed before sending trade pacts, <http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/07/21/us-usa-trade-deals-idUSTRE76K0HH20110721>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

(Reuters) - President Barack Obama's administration on Thursday fended off Republican demands that it send three long-delayed free trade pacts to Congress for approval, saying it first needed more assurance that a retraining program for displaced workers will be extended. Senate Republican leader Mitch McConnell urged Obama to transmit the trade deals with South Korea, Colombia and Panama even though Congress would not have time to complete action on the agreements until after the August break.

Won’t pass- Only thing people agree on is “free trade is bad”

Forquer 10(Mark, analyst in the global trade group of a Fortune 500 company. He spent several years living in Asia and has masters degrees in diplomacy and international business. Author for Foreign Policy Association. “US-SKFTA FAIL!” 11/14/10 <http://foreignpolicyblogs.com/2010/11/14/us-skfta-fail/>)

The sad reality is that this whole charade is irrelevant. The chance of a free trade agreement passing through Congress, even, if not opposed by the auto and been industries, is hard to imagine. The new congress, made up more than ever by extremists on both sides, seem to agree on only one thing: free trade is bad. The irony is free trade is the one area where the President and Republicans could actually work together. Had President Obama managed to stick to his own deadline and get this deal signed while in Korea, he may have had a chance of bring something home that he could get through a lame duck congress. At this point the USSKFTA is all but dead.

Won’t Pass – South Korea

Opposition in South Korea prevents passage

Wall Street Journal 7/21 (EVAN RAMSTAD, Wall Street Journal, Korean Opposition Knocks U.S. Deal, 7/21/11, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111903554904576457391306394236.html?mod=googlenews_wsj>, accessed 7/23/11, AA)

The leader of South Korea's main opposition party on Wednesday said the South Korea-U.S. free-trade agreement needs a major overhaul, another sign that the deal's ratification in Parliament here will hinge on the willingness of the ruling party to use its majority status to pass it. In an interview, Sohn Hak-kyu, the opposition Democratic Party chairman, said it is still possible for the pact to gain support from his party. "We are not totally against the free-trade agreement, but there are conditions we'd like to see met," Mr. Sohn said. The party on Tuesday issued a statement urging Korean trade officials to seek new negotiations with the U.S. to make 10 changes in the pact, including delaying the reductions on food tariffs, which are fundamental to the deal. The party also said it won't support the FTA unless new Korean laws are passed to compensate companies and individuals who might be hurt by its implementation.

\*\*Impacts\*\*

Terrorism Module

Free trade agreements are key to stop terrorism.

Prebele in 2003 (Christopher, writer for the Cato Institute, Oct. 20, 2003, “Free Trade: A Potent Weapon Against Terror’, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=3277>) AS

This week's Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation summit in Bangkok provides President George W. Bush with an opportunity to promote free trade as a weapon in the fight against global terrorism, something that his administration has so far largely failed to do. An unequivocal commitment to free trade would erode the terrorists' hateful claims that the US and its allies intend to keep Muslims poor and weak. Formed in 1989, before the fall of the Berlin Wall, APEC has thrived in the post-Cold War environment, with the number of member nations growing from 11 to 21. There was once some hope that APEC could become a vehicle for liberalising trade throughout the region, creating a kind of super-NAFTA based on free and fair trade. The hope remains, but the prospects for that happening seem even stiffer, after the great divide between the rich and poor nations helped scuttle last month's Cancun World Trade Organisation talks. The after-effects of that collapse hang over the APEC meeting. The recent attempt by the Association of South-East Asian Nations to establish a free trade zone in South-East Asia is an example of the frustrations of developing countries. The ASEAN initiative would create an EU-like economic community by 2020, with particular attention on liberalising 11 key sectors, including tourism and electronics, by 2010. The 10 members of ASEAN, eight of whom are also members of the larger APEC group, are no doubt trying to go around the selective free trade policies (meaning, unfree trade policies), practised by several of the larger APEC nations, the US and Japan, especially. Protectionism in agriculture and textiles is especially galling. The Bush administration's decision to expand America's shameful and counterproductive agricultural policies is certain to draw attention -- and scorn -- at APEC. And rightly so. Agricultural price supports and other anti-market measures cost US taxpayers more than $20 billion a year while simultaneously undermining America's credibility abroad. For the US to preach the merits of free trade, and then punish developing nations that are striving to open their economies, is the worst kind of hypocrisy. In the absence of a truly free and fair worldwide trading regime, the prospects for which seem even more remote following the collapse at Cancun, Americans should look upon the ASEAN free-trade initiative not as a threat, but as a good. Unfortunately, some US policy-makers view the ASEAN initiative as a challenge to American dominance in the region. This attitude is in keeping with a broader inclination to look sceptically on any measure of independence by other countries. To make matters worse, Washington is using the promise of preferential trade agreements and the threat of economic sanctions as a perverse carrot-and-stick strategy for fighting terrorism. Consider this: Bush has celebrated recent anti-terrorism successes in the region, including the arrest of terrorist kingpin Hambali. His capture, a joint operation involving the Royal Thai Police and US officials, following an eight-month manhunt, marks one of the most important breakthroughs in the two-year-long war on terrorism. Bush may reward Thailand's support by announcing plans to launch bilateral free-trade negotiations next year. (Washington has negotiated trading pacts with Singapore, and hopes to close a similar agreement with Australia by the end of the year.) But free trade should not be seen merely as a bargaining chip. Free trade is a good, contributing to better living standards for all peoples. Unfortunately, the very forms of beneficial voluntary person-to-person contact that are instrumental in defeating terrorism, and that are celebrated by the free-market trade, private investment, tourism, cultural exchange -- have come to a near standstill. Reversing these trends should be a primary objective in the campaign against terrorism.

And, terrorists are guaranteed to obtain biological weapons.

Simon in 1997 (Jeffery, Ph.D, August 6, 1997, “Biological Terrorism: Preparing to Meet the Threat”, <http://jama.ama-assn.org/content/278/5/428.short>)

The threat of terrorists using biological warfare agents has received increased attention in recent years. Despite the hope that, with the right mix of policies, security measures, and intelligence gathering, a major biological warfare terrorist attack can be prevented, the history of conventional terrorism indicates otherwise. The greatest payoff in combating biological terrorism lies in focusing on how best to respond to a terrorist attack. The medical and emergency service communities will play the most important role in that process. Ensuring that they are trained to recognize the symptoms of diseases caused by biological warfare agents and have Critical Incident Stress Debriefing teams available to help them cope with the emotional aspects of treating exposed survivors should be part of contingency planning. By improving our readiness to respond to biological terrorism, many lives can be saved and terrorists denied their goal of creating panic and crisis throughout the country.

Terrorism Module (2/2)

And, the use of biological agents causes extinction.

**McGoven, Christopher, and Eitzen in 1999** (Thomas, George, and Edward, March 1999, “Cutaneous Manifestations of Biological Warfare and Related Threat Agents”, <http://archderm.ama-assn.org/cgi/content/full/135/3/311>) AS

Biological warfare agents can cause large numbers of casualties with minimal logistical requirements. Perpetrators can escape long before BW agents incubate and cause casualties. Weapons are easy and relatively inexpensive to produce and can be used to selectively target humans, animals, or plants. Agents can be easily procured from the environment, universities, biological supply houses, and clinical specimens.10 Common fermentation techniques used for producing antibiotics, vaccines, foods, and beverages can be adapted to grow large quantities of biological agents. Simple aerosol-generating devices mounted on planes or trucks, like those used for crop dusting, can be adapted to generate 1- to 5-µm particles ideal for lodging in alveoli.13 Such aerosols would be undetectable by our senses, and an attack might not be noted until people became ill. Panic could result as medical capabilities become quickly overwhelmed. Aerosolization of biological agents often results in different clinical features of disease than those observed following natural infection. For instance, anthrax is usually a cutaneous disease in nature, but a rapidly fatal hemorrhagic mediastinitis ensues after inhaling spores. Biological attacks could be attempted by contaminating water supplies, although modern water purification and the dilution effects of large water volumes would negate the effectiveness of such an attack.1 While intact skin provides a barrier to most BW agents, the trichothecene mycotoxins can penetrate the skin and cause systemic effects.10 Ingestion and cutaneous penetration are currently considered as unimportant potential routes of exposure.10 Agents could be dispersed by releasing them in their natural arthropod vectors. Person-to-person aerosol transmission of several agents (notably plague and smallpox) could perpetuate an epidemic. Last, nosocomial transmission could also cause casualties following exposure to contaminated blood, body fluids, or respiratory secretions.

A2 – Small Farms Turn

South Korean Free Trade Agreement is Important for U.S. Beef Producers

Ron Hays. 2011 Beef Buzzes with Iowa Cattlemen's Association President-Elect Ed Greiman on the importance of a South Korea Free Trade AgreementWed, 15 Jun 2011 09:46:47 CDT http://www.oklahomafarmreport.com/wire/news/2011/06/00020\_BeefBuzz06152011\_094547.php

The recent buzz about the Free Trade Agreements is well known among cattle producers today. Many different agricultural groups are hopeful that Congress will address trade issues with the passage of the pending free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama and South Korea before the end of the summer to help ensure a growth in beef markets.    Iowa cattle producer Ed Greiman recently visited South Korea with the Iowa Cattlemen’s Association, which he is the association's President-Elect. Greiman says he saw the potential for a phenomenal market in South Korea, which was nothing like he had envisioned. Korea is full of middle class consumers and they are looking to add protein and beef to their diets says Greiman.    Greiman says this growing interest in using beef by South Koreans is an opportunity for U.S. beef producers because South Korea just can't provide adequate quantities for their population. This places a great amount of importance on the free trade agreement with South Korea and making the trade deal.    Aside from the free trade agreement – Greiman says it’s important to remember who the end customer is and to keep food safety in mind- making sure we provide a safe and wholesome product is very important to the South Korean consumer.

Aff – North Korea Turn

SKFTA gives North Korea the cash they need to build nuclear weapons.

By The Citizen 7/2/11. no author was indentified. Citizen.org is a non- profit organization that has worked since 1971 to represent the citizens in the halls of power. June 2 2011. http://www.citizen.org/documents/kaesong-factsheet.pdf

North Korea is only five years away from building a nuclear missile capable of attacking America. Security experts say that the only thing that stands in their way is cash. On a bipartisan basis, members of the U.S. Congress have urged a tightening of existing U.S. economic sanctions against North Korea. Despite that, the Obama administration is now pushing a trade agreement with South Korea that perversely could provide a flood of new money for the North Korean dictatorship to bolster their weapons program, as well as maintain their stranglehold over the North Korean people. The official U.S. government study of the Korea Free Trade Agreement (FTA) found that it would increase Korean imports here by $6 billion annually and increase the overall U.S. trade deficit. If the FTA is implemented as written, that increased trade will include goods assembled in South Korea – but comprised of large amounts of North Korean inputs sourced in the Kaesong Industrial Complex. This is a sweatshop zone located 40 miles north of Seoul where 120 South Korean firms employ 44,000 North Koreans, whose meager 25-38 cents per hour wages are paid to the North Korean government, which keeps half. The FTA also includes several ways for good actually assembled in North Korea to obtain benefits under the trade deal. While North Korea is one of the world’s most economically isolated countries, it has quietly sought to develop deeper ties with investors, especially from South Korea, in order to obtain needed cash. Almost ten years ago, the South Korean multinational conglomerate Hyundai cut a deal with the North Korean government to obtain a 50- year lease to build a massive sweatshop zone – called the Kaesong Industrial Complex. It is located 43 miles north of Seoul, just north of the Military Demarcation Line at the 38th parallel that has divided the two Koreas since the Korean war. There are currently 120 South Korean firms in Kaesong, employing over 40,000 North Korean workers, who are shipped in daily and supervised by North Korea Korean handlers with a loud speaker system blaring North Korean political messages. Hyundai has signed a new lease to enlarge the zone from its current 800 acres to an over 6,000 acre complex, where 1,500 South Korean and other foreign firms will employ 350,000 North Korean. The planned ratification of the South Korea-U.S. free trade agreement will pave the way for the export of products built in Kaesong to the U.S. market. [According to] South Korea’s U.S. Ambassador Han Duk-Soo.

**North Korea will use their nukes in a 1st strike when they get them**

North Korea would use nuclear weapons in a 'merciless offensive' by the Associated Press Tuesday, 9 June2009 http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/north-korea-would-use-nuclear-weapons-in-a-merciless-offensive-1700590.html

Pyongyang raised tensions a notch by reviving its rhetoric in a commentary in the state-run Minju Joson newspaper today. "Our nuclear deterrent will be a strong defensive means...as well as a merciless offensive means to deal a just retaliatory strike to those who touch the country's dignity and sovereignty even a bit," said the commentary, carried by the official Korean Central News Agency. It appeared to be the first time that North Korea referred to its nuclear arsenal as "offensive" in nature. Pyongyang has long claimed that its nuclear weapons program is a deterrent and only for self-defense against what it calls US attempts to invade it.

Aff – Global Warming Turn

SKFTA will not produce jobs and leads to global warming

U.S.-South Korea Free Trade Agreement: an attack on workers in both countries By Martha Grevatt

Detroit Published Jan 20, 2011 9:09 PM http://www.workers.org/2011/world/fta\_0127/

“I am very pleased that the United States and South Korea have reached agreement on a landmark trade deal that is expected to increase annual exports of American goods by up to $11 billion and support at least 70,000 American jobs,” stated President Barack Obama last December.This “landmark deal” makes modifications to KORUS — the free trade agreement negotiated by former President George W. Bush and former south Korean President Roh Moo-hyun in 2007. Obama had campaigned against this agreement during his 2008 presidential bid. KORUS-FTA’s selling points are changes affecting the import and export of cars, trucks and agricultural products. The United Auto Workers and United Food and Commercial Workers union also issued statements of support. Few workers, however, are raising a glass to what looks to them like another NAFTA. In effect since January 1, 1994, the North American Free Trade Agreement was passed with the support of Congressional Democrats and President Bill Clinton. NAFTA was followed by passage of similar trade pacts with Peru, Singapore and the Dominican Republic.Since then, claims that lowering trade barriers would create jobs have been proven false. In 1994 the UAW had almost 766,000 dues-paying members. Today that figure is about 355,000. In 2009 the largest number of job cuts in a single company occurred at General Motors. The “side agreements” covering labor rights and the environment have been worse than ineffective. In the U.S. thousands of workers are fired every year for trying to organize unions. Recently, electrical workers fighting privatization in Mexico were beaten and arrested. What about protections for the environment? Can you spell BP? In fact, free trade agreements protect polluters through “investor-state dispute settlement” (ISDS) provisions that allow corporations to file lawsuits when their investments are negatively affected.When the Mexican town of Guadalcázar blocked the U.S. company Metalclad from constructing a landfill over local objections, NAFTA’s ISDS language allowed the company to sue and force Mexico to grant the permit and pay a fine of $16.5 million. Worse than NAFTA, the “labor rights” language of KORUS has not been touched in the supposedly improved version. The agreement expressly prohibits any reference to the International Labor Organization’s conventions on the right to organize and bargain collectively. Instead, disputes are to be resolved by a “Labor Council” comprised of representatives of the two governments — neither of which is a friend of unions.The International Metalworkers Federation states that in south Korea “labor repression is among the worst in the world.” (www.imfmetal.org) Around 200 union activists are in prison; they include leaders of the Korean Metal Workers Union, jailed for over a year for a 2009 sitdown strike at Ssangyong Motors, and of the Korean Confederation of Trade Unions that protested KORUS in 2007. Recent struggles of autoworkers at Hyundai and GM Daewoo have drawn attention to the plight of 8.5 million temporary or “precarious” workers, who are more than half of all south Korean workers and two-thirds of women workers. The KMWU predicts that KORUS-FTA will increase precarious work.For the 30 million unemployed or underemployed U.S. workers, 70,000 jobs would do little. In fact, any job creation due to exports will likely be more than offset by imports of other products. Moreover, the agreement encourages companies to move jobs overseas. According to the U.S. State Department’s 2010 Investment Climate Statement, south Korea, KORUS-FTA “would be a major step to enhance the legal framework for U.S. investors operating in Korea. All forms of investment would be protected under the KORUS-FTA agreement. ... In addition, these protections would be backed by a transparent international arbitration mechanism, under which investors may, at their own initiative, bring claims against a government for an alleged breach of the KORUS-FTA chapter.” Like NAFTA, KORUS-FTA is bad for the environment. Communities that take action against corporate polluters could likely see a repeat of the Metalclad case. The changes in the new free trade agreement, hailed by both Ford CEO Alan Mulally and UAW President Bob King, make it easier for Detroit to export vehicles by lowering south Korea’s fuel economy standards and reducing higher taxes on larger engines. That means more carbon emissions, adding to global warming. On both sides of the Pacific, unions are raising their voices against this rotten deal. The AFL-CIO has come out against it, along with the Steelworkers, Machinists, Communication Workers, and United Electrical workers, as well as the International Longshore Workers Union. Rank-and-file autoworkers are circulating petitions against KORUS-FTA. The KMWU, the KCTU and the Federation of Korean Trade Unions remain steadfastly opposed to any free trade agreement. Stopping the FTA was a major demand of November protests in Seoul during the G-20 Summit. Last month thousands of farmers, fearing the loss of 200,000 agricultural jobs if U.S. agribusiness floods south Korea with mass-produced food items, took to the streets in protest.

[insert warming impact]

Aff – Small Farms Turn

Trade agreements destroy small farms

Buchanan, 5/12 (Bryan Buchanan, REPORTERS’ MEMO Korea Trade Deal’s Negative Impact on U.S. Agriculture, May 12, 2011 http://www.citizen.org/documents/memo-korea-ag-may-12-2011.pdf)AC

Despite claims by these corporate interests that FTAs are a mechanism to expand exports, U.S. exports to FTA countries have grown at less than half the rate of those to non-FTA countries. This means that U.S. farmers alone missed out on nearly $3 billion in export opportunities over the past decade – the amount we would have seen had just agricultural exports to Mexico and other FTA countries simply grown at the average rate over the period. The NAFTA model has been a failure for rural communities. Since NAFTA and similar deals with 17 other countries were implemented, America has lost hundreds of thousands of family farms. Large agribusiness companies have been able to use these trade deals to drive down the prices that farmers receive – playing producers in trade partner countries off of each other while concentrating ownership of trading, seed and other agribusiness firms.

Extinction

Boyce 04 (James K , Ph.D. in economics from Oxford University , “A Future for Small Farms", <http://www.umass.edu/peri/> pdfs/WP86.pdf)

There is a future for small farms. Or more precisely, there can be and should be a future for them. Given the dependence of ‘modern’ low-diversity agriculture on ‘traditional’  high-diversity agriculture, the long-term food security of humankind will depend on  small farms and their continued provision of the environmental service of in situ  conservation of crop genetic diversity. Policies to support small farms can be advocated,  therefore, not merely as a matter of sympathy, or nostalgia, or equity. Such policies are  also a matter of human survival.  The diversity that underpins the sustainability of world agriculture did not fall from the  sky. It was bequeathed to us by the 400 generations of farmers who have carried on the  process of artificial selection since plants were first domesticated. Until recently, we took  this diversity for granted. The ancient reservoirs of crop genetic diversity, plant geneticist  Jack Harlan (1975, p. 619) wrote three decades ago, ‘seemed to most people as  inexhaustible as oil in Arabia.’ Yet, Harlan warned, ‘the speed which enormous crop  diversity can be essentially wiped out is astonishing.’  The central thesis of this essay is that efforts to conserve in situ diversity must go hand-  in-hand with efforts to support the small farmers around the world who sustain this  diversity. Economists and environmentalists alike by and large have neglected this issue.  In thrall to a myopic notion of efficiency, many economists fail to appreciate that  diversity is the sine qua non of resilience and sustainability. In thrall to a romantic notion  of ‘wilderness,’ many environmentalists fail to appreciate that agricultural biodiversity is  just as valuable – indeed, arguably more valuable from the standpoint of human well-  being – as the diversity found in tropical rainforests or the spotted owls found in the  ancient forests of the northwestern United States

Aff – SKFTA Bad (Laundry Listy)

SKFTA is a failure on multiple levels

Fletcher, 7/17 (Ian Fletcher, We Don't Need Free Trade Agreements with Panama, Colombia, and Korea, The Market Oracle, Jul 17, 2011 - 05:23 AM http://www.marketoracle.co.uk/Article29309.html)AC

As an example of how one-sided the treaty is, consider that it now allows -- to great rejoicing -- America to export 75,000 cars a year to Korea. This translates to a measly 800 jobs. Korea's exports of cars to the U.S. in 2009, on the other hand? Try 476,833 Furthermore, even if the U.S. does get to sell more cars in Korea, American companies will mostly not be making the steel, tires, and other components that go into them, because the agreement allows cars with 65 percent foreign content to count as "American." Worse, it allows goods with as much as 65 percent non-South-Korean content to count as "Korean," opening the door not only to North Korean slave labor but to the whole of China. Talk about the camel's nose in the tent! This is just one example of how KORUS-FTA isn't even as good as the deal the EU just signed with Korea. (The EU got a 55 percent standard on this item.) And remember that the EU and most of its member states, of course, don't really practice free trade anyway: they practice a covertly managed trade that has kept the EU's trade balance within pocket change of zero over the last two decades, while America has been running deficits around the $500 billion mark. "Free trade agreement," in American English, means "free trade agreement." In other languages, it means "gentleman's agreement for managed trade at a low tariff." The Europeans invented this game -- called mercantilism -- back when trade was conducted with sailing ships. South Korea learned it from Japan, which learned it from Germany. Uncle Sam (and maybe John Bull and a few others) are the only naïfs who still don't get it. Despite what the White House and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce are saying, this agreement makes no sense as a strategy to reduce our horrendous trade deficit. America's trade deficits have a long record of going up, not down, when we sign trade agreements with other nations. Paradoxically, trade agreements even seem to sabotage our own trade with foreign nations: according to an analysis by the group Public Citizen, in recent years our exports to nations we have free-trade agreements with have actually grown at less than half the pace of our exports to nations we don't have these agreements with. So these agreements don't hold water as trade-expanding measures. Even leaving aside trade-balance issues, this agreement is a disaster, thanks to something called "investor-state arbitration." Like NAFTA, it compromises American sovereignty and subjects American democracy to having its own laws overruled by foreign judges as interfering with trade. Under NAFTA to date, over $326 million in damages has been paid out by governments as a result of challenges to natural resource policies, environmental protection, and health and safety measures. There about 80 Korean corporations, with about 270 facilities around the U.S., that would acquire the right to challenge our laws under KORUS-FTA. What kind of problems could this cause? The U.S. was forced in 1996 to weaken Clean Air Act rules on gasoline contaminants in response to a challenge by Venezuela and Brazil. In 1998, we were forced to weaken Endangered Species Act protections for sea turtles thanks to a challenge by India, Malaysia, Pakistan and Thailand concerning the shrimp industry. The EU today endures trade sanctions by the U.S. for not relaxing its ban on hormone-treated beef. In 1996, the WTO ruled against the EU's Lome Convention, a preferential trading scheme for 71 former European colonies in the Third World. In 2003, the Bush administration sued the EU over its moratorium on genetically modified foods. It gets worse. KORUS-FTA also signs away our right (and Korea's, too, not that this makes it any better) to a wide range of financial regulations of the kind that might have helped avoid the crisis of 2008. For example, it forfeits our right to limit the size of financial institutions. It forfeits our right to place firewalls between different kinds of financial activities in order to prevent volatility in one market from collapsing another. It prevents us from limiting what financial services financial institutions may offer—Enron Savings & Mortgage, here we come... It bans regulation of derivatives. It ban limits on capital flows designed to tame volatile “hot money.” Why is the U.S. flirting with making such an appalling mistake yet again? Because a) multinational corporations have bought our political system and b) because our government would rather play power politics than keep its own (declining) economic house in order. It is remarkable how stuck we are in the 1950s, with an invincible economy at home and a Cold War abroad. As a report by the Senate Finance Committee once put it: Throughout most of the postwar era, U.S. trade policy has been the orphan of U.S. foreign policy. Too often the Executive has granted trade concessions to accomplish political objectives. Rather than conducting U.S. international economic relations on sound economic and commercial principles, the executive has set trade and monetary policy in a foreign aid context. An example has been the Executive's unwillingness to enforce U.S. trade statutes in response to foreign unfair trade practices.Ironically, it may eventually be our own decline that solves our trade problems, by rescuing us from our own arrogance and stupidity. When we finally realize we can't take our economy for granted, we may finally stop giving away the store in international trade